DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 333 HE 023 778

AUTHOR	Kroll, Ronald C.
TITLE	Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of an Academic Advising Model for Use in the Small, Private College.
PUB DATE	Jun 90
NOTE	226p.; Ed.D. Requirements, Nova University.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Advising; *Counseling Techniques; *Faculty Advisers; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Models; Participant Satisfaction; Private Colleges; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	Practical Bible Training School NY

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was to identify academic advising strategies that would be appropriate for the small, private college setting; to develop an academic advising system; and to implement the system through a trial model at Practical Bible Training School in Binghamton, New York. The model consisted of preservice and inservice training for advisers, intrusive advising for high-risk students, dissemination of profile data on new students to advisers, streamlined registration and group advising, and development of advising support materials. The model was evaluated through the use of two 25-item pretest-posttest questionnaires. Both students and advisers preferred procedures and materials used in the advising trial model over the former advising system by a significant margin. Adviser satisfaction improved in the following areas, among others: timely notification of advising assignments, information about abilities of advisees, and satisfaction with the level of institutional support and recognition for advisers. Student satisfaction improved in the areas of adviser knowledge of program requirements, help in selecting appropriate courses, and adviser clarification of college policies and procedures. Appendices contain advising support materials, adviser training handouts, evaluation instruments, and supporting statistical data. Includes 92 references. (Author/JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED331333

DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF AN ACADEMIC ADVISING MODEL FOR USE IN THE SMALL, PRIVATE COLLEGE

by

Ronald C. Kroll

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
RONALD C.
KROLL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

HE 023 778

A Major Applied Research Project present in
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

June 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Ronald C. Kroll, Bible School Park, NY 13737
All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the faculty and administration of Practical Bible Training School for their assistance in implementing this project. Without their support, completion of this project would not have been possible. Appreciation is also expressed to John Losak (MARP adviser), David S. Flight, and Louis F. Weislogel for their suggestions and direction in the production of this document. The author is particularly indebted to his wife, Kathryn, not only for her assistance in data entry, but also for her enduring patience and constant encouragement.

Abstract of a Major Applied Research Project Presented
to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF AN ACADEMIC ADVISING MODEL FOR USE IN THE SMALL, PRIVATE COLLEGE

by

Ronald C. Kroll

June 1990

Practical Bible Training School (PBTS) is a small, private college in need of improved academic advising services. The purpose of this project was to identify strategies in academic advising that would be appropriate for implementation in the small, private college setting, to develop an academic advising system that would address problems experienced at PBTS, and to implement and evaluate such a system through a trial model. A successful program would necessitate limited expansion of resources or personnel, applicability on an institution-wide basis, and demonstrated improvement in adviser and student satisfaction.

A trial model was developed and implemented during the 1989-90 academic year. It consisted of pre- and in-service training for advisers, intrusive advising for high-risk students, dissemination of profile data on new students to

advisers, streamlined registration and group advising, development of advising support materials, placement of an advising file in the library containing appropriate support materials for student use, and evaluation of advising services by both advisers and students.

The model was evaluated through two twenty-five item, pretest-posttest questionnaires. One questionnaire assessed the satisfaction of the ten academic advisers with advising services and support; the other assessed the satisfaction of all returning students (approximately 60). The questionnaires were administered as a pretest at the beginning of the fall 1989 semester, and as a posttest at the end of the spring 1990 semester. An advising preferences survey was also administered to advisers and both returning and new students at the end of the spring 1990 semester.

The implementation of the academic advising trial model was responsible for a substantial reduction in the number of advising areas rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of academic advisers or returning students. Overall increase in the mean and median levels of satisfaction were found for both academic advisers and students. Statistically significant improvements in adviser satisfaction were found in fifteen of the twenty-five areas examined, and in returning student satisfaction in seventeen of the twenty-five analysis areas.

Significant improvements in adviser satisfaction included the following: timely notification of advising assignments, information about prior abilities of advisees, tracking of the academic progress of high-risk advisees, awareness of advisee plans to drop a course or withdraw from school, information about support services and course options, sufficient resources to help advisees, satisfaction with registration and pre-registration, and satisfaction with the level of institutional support and recognition for advisers. Student satisfaction significantly improved for adviser clarification of recommendations and college policies and procedures, adviser knowledge of program requirements, tracking of what courses the advisee needed, and help in selecting appropriate courses, and adviser tracking of academic progress and help with academic problems. Significant improvements were also found for discussion of college support services, adviser availability, friendship, and genuine concern about the welfare and growth of the advisee, and the advisee's overall experience with advising.

Both students and advisers preferred procedures and materials used in the advising trial model over the former advising system by a significant margin. Former procedures were preferred in only one of the twenty-six areas modified (advisers preferred that students get academic petition forms from the academic office instead of the adviser). It was recommended that PBTS adopt a permanent advising program based on the components of the advising trial model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT iii

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

    Background and Significance 1

    Research Questions 3

    Definition of Terms 3

    Limitations 6

    Assumptions 7

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 8

    The Importance of Academic Advising 8

    Characteristics of Good Advisers 12

    Responsibilities of Academic Advisers 15

    Successful Academic Advising Models 21

    Group Advising 23

    Intrusive Advising 25

    Adviser Training 35

    Materials for Academic Advising 37

    Background Factors in Advising New Students 41

    Evaluation of Academic Advising 47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Chapter Page

3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY 50

Development of Advising Support Materials 50

Adviser Training 52

Implementation of New Procedures 54

System Evaluation, Instrumentation, and Data Collection 59

Treatment of Data 61

4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 64

5. INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 98

Interpretation of Results 98

Pretest-Posttest Evaluation 98

Advising Preferences Survey 104

Comparison of Findings to Those in the Literature 107

Conclusions 111

Recommendations for the Improvement of Practice, Including Strategies for Diffusion, Implementation, and Improvement 115

REFERENCES 120

APPENDIXES

A. ADVISING SUPPORT MATERIALS 129

Weekly Schedule
Program Planning Worksheet
Grade Estimate Sheet
Course Requirement Summary
Advising Contract
Academic Record Profile
New Student Questionnaire

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

APPENDIX Page

B. ADVISER TRAINING HANDOUTS 139

Characteristics of Good Advisers
Intrusive Advising
Summary Profile of New Students Entering PBTS, Fall 1989
Pre-Registration Information

C. EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS 146

Adviser Evaluation of Advising
Student Evaluation of Advising
Advising Preferences Survey

D. PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR RETURNING STUDENTS 154

E. PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR ACADEMIC ADVISERS 158

F. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF RETURNING STUDENTS 162

G. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF ACADEMIC ADVISERS 166

H. RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION 170

I. RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION 176

SIGNATURE PAGE 182

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Pretest Evaluation Items Rated "Poor" or "Very Poor" by over Ten Percent of Returning Students or Academic Advisers . . . 66

2. Posttest Evaluation Items Rated "Poor" or "Very Poor" by over Ten Percent of Academic Advisers 68

3. Questionnaire Items with a Pretest-Posttest Median or Mean Difference of One Scale Point or More for Returning Students 70

4. Questionnaire Items with a Pretest-Posttest Median or Mean Difference of One Scale Point or More for Academic Advisers 72

5. Distribution of Returning Students with an Increase, Decrease, or No Change in Satisfaction 74

6. Distribution of Academic Advisers with an Increase, Decrease, or No Change in Satisfaction 77

7. Advising Areas with a Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Returning Students 79

8. Advising Areas with No Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Returning Students 81

9. Advising Areas with a Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Academic Advisers 82

10. Advising Areas with No Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Academic Advisers 84

11. Percentage Distribution of Advisers and Students Preferring Old and New Advising Methods 86

12. Methods Preferred by Advisers, All Students, Returning Students, or New Students 93

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Practical Bible Training School (PBTS) is a small, private college with less than two hundred students, located in Binghamton, New York. Specializing in ministry careers, the college operates a three-year diploma program with five professional majors, and a one-year certificate program in Bible. Academic advising for all students is provided by the ten fulltime faculty members as a required administrative function.

Background and Significance

Several administrators and faculty members have recently expressed concern over the lack of a systematic program for academic advising at PBTS. Advisers were unclear as to their responsibilities, and received little direction in how to perform their academic advising duties. No training in advising techniques and procedures was provided; furthermore, minimal materials had been made available to assist academic advisers in their advising responsibilities. Since all fulltime faculty were required to do academic advising, there was concern that the quality of advising services may have varied from one adviser to another.

Several problems have developed from a lack of structured advising services. There was no system within the institution to promote increased adviser contact with high-risk students or to provide advisers with information on the academic background or progress of students assigned to them; consequently, high-risk students received little guidance in improving their academic performance. Advisers received no information about the academic abilities of new advisees, and had to wait and observe performance during the first semester of the student's enrollment before assessing the need for intervention. Both advisers and students may have had limited awareness of the availability of academic support services, and advisers may not have been making adequate use of referrals. Long range academic planning was not supported in the advising system, and students usually selected their electives based on what courses were available in the current semester, rather than projecting what courses would best complement their personal or professional goals.

The purpose of this project was to identify strategies in academic advising that would be appropriate for implementation in the small, private college setting, to develop an academic advising system that would address problems experienced at PBTS, and to implement and evaluate such a system through a trial model. An appropriate system for the small college setting in general, and PBTS in particular, would require limited expansion of resources or personnel, would be applicable on an institution-wide basis, and would show signs of improvement in adviser and advisee satisfaction over the status quo.

Research Questions

Answers to several questions were sought in this project. What academic advising strategies were effective at other institutions? What areas of advising did students perceive to be less than adequate at PBTS? What areas of advising did faculty advisers consider to be unsatisfactory? What improvements in adviser and student satisfaction would result from the implementation of selected strategies through a trial model? What strategies did advisers and students wish to see in continuous use? What materials did advisers and students consider the most helpful?

Definition of Terms

Small college. An institution of higher education with an enrollment of under one thousand students. Small colleges are often characterized by emphasis on small classes and personal attention. Academic advising in the small college is usually performed by fulltime faculty members rather than professional support staff.

One-year student. A student enrolled in the PBTS thirty-six credit hour program in Bible. This is a general program primarily intended for students who are undecided about their educational future.

Three-year student. A student enrolled in one of the professional ministry majors of the PBTS three-year program. Students in the first year of this program are referred to as freshmen. Students in the second and third years are referred to as juniors and seniors, respectively.

Special student. Any student enrolled for college credit at PBTS but not pursuing the one-year certificate or the three-year diploma.

Day college student. An academic designation used to identify a student enrolled for more than six credit hours per semester or pursuing graduation in the three-year or one-year program. Day college students may take college credit courses during either day or evening class sessions. Most relevant to this project, only day college students are assigned to an academic adviser.

Returning student. A student who has been continuously enrolled at the college since the spring semester of the previous academic year. Enrollment is considered to be continuous if the student is enrolled in consecutive fall and spring semesters; summer school enrollment is not considered.

New student. A student who has not been continuously enrolled at the college since the spring semester of the previous academic year. Students who withdraw from all classes for one or more semesters are considered new students when they re-enroll. In this study, the classification of new student is maintained for the entire academic year; consequently, new students entering in the fall semester retain the classification of new student into the spring semester.

Academic probation. A classification for returning students with a cumulative grade point average (GPA) below 2.0, or for new students with a high school GPA below 2.0 or an American College Testing Program (ACT) composite score below 15 (Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT] combined verbal and mathematics equivalent of 700). Students on academic probation are restricted to no more than fifteen credit hours per semester. Students who have been on academic probation for two consecutive semesters are restricted to no more than twelve credit hours per semester. Students who continue on academic probation beyond two semesters are subject to academic review and possible dismissal. Students on academic probation are often referred to as "high-risk."

Regular fulltime course load. A list of courses that should be taken by one-year students and freshmen, juniors, and seniors in a particular program so as to complete all requirements in the designated time period, either one year or three years. Failure to take the courses as indicated in this listing may prevent the student from graduating on time due to course schedule conflicts or the unavailability of required courses offered on a two-year rotation. The regular fulltime course load differs from the catalog listing of program requirements only in that it adjusts for required courses that are offered on a two-year rotation. Most PBTS students take the regular fulltime course load.

Student ministry. A required internship program for all students. Each student must participate in an approved, supervised, leadership activity in a local church or parachurch organization for each semester of attendance at PBTS. The one-hour, weekly activity should relate to the student's academic major as an application of ministry techniques learned in the classroom.

Pretest-posttest sample. Returning students or academic advisers who completed both pre-implementation and post-implementation evaluations. Any individual who failed to complete both evaluations was eliminated from the pretest-posttest sample.

Limitations

Results are limited to students enrolled at PBTS during the 1989-90 academic year. Student performance, the need for advising services, and attitudes about academic advising at PBTS during other years or at other institutions may vary considerably. Results are also limited to responses indicated on the questionnaires administered before and after the implementation of the trial model. These responses are subjective, individual perceptions of satisfaction with advising, and may vary based on external circumstances and expectations. A further limitation is that approximately 130 participants were involved in the trial model implementation, with about sixty returning students and ten advisers participating in both the pre-implementation and post-implementation surveys. It was also not possible to guarantee that every student who should have completed a questionnaire actually did so.

Assumptions

It was assumed that advisers and students participating in the implementation and evaluation of this trial model had similar needs and concerns as those who will be at PBTS in the next few years. The samples completing questionnaires were assumed to represent the current adviser and student populations at PBTS adequately. It was assumed that respondents were honest and accurate in their responses on the questionnaires, and that the influence of external factors on responses given was not significant. It was also assumed that the instruments used in this study adequately addressed the major relevant issues in student and adviser satisfaction with academic advising. The length of the implementation period was assumed to be sufficient to provide advisers and students with an adequate perception of their satisfaction with new procedures and materials, and that perceptions would not significantly change with a different time frame in use.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Importance of Academic Advising

The significance of academic advising in postsecondary education is well treated in the literature. In a national survey of colleges with enrollments under 5,000, Richardson et al. (1985) found that personal adjustment to college, career and life planning, academic difficulties, and basic skills remediation--traditionally elements of academic advising--were among the seven leading counseling problems encountered by student affairs personnel. Noel et al. (1985) suggested that three of the six primary obstacles to persistence in college were completing institutional procedures, selecting appropriate courses, and budgeting time for academic work--also tasks usually dealt with through academic advising. Brown and Russell (1988) found that persisters in college frequently reported using advising services, while over half of those who withdrew before graduation had never used advising services or did not know they existed. Parris (1982) found that students who received advisement had significantly higher GPAs than students who did not receive advisement.

Winston et al. (1984) found that there was a significant correlation between student satisfaction and the student's relationship with faculty members, and that student satisfaction and retention were directly related to the quality of academic advising received. Noel et al. (1985) found that retention was the by-product of improvements in services and programs, and that dissatisfied students at an institution infected other students with dissatisfaction, resulting in increased attrition. Schubert and Munski (1985) found that better academic advising was often the result of efforts to increase student retention, to reduce problems in registration procedures, and to develop more realistic study goals.

Several other researchers have noted the correlation between academic advising and retention. Stodt (1987) claimed that poor academic advising was the primary reason given by students for dropping out of college. Metzner and Bean (1987) found that academic advising ranked seventh out of twenty-six variables related to persistence. Johnson (1986) also found academic advising to be one of the key factors in student retention. Buhr, Pelletier, and Wark (1987) found that the first day on campus was the most critical from a retention perspective, and that the most influential person on that day was the academic adviser.

Tinto (1987) claimed that quality advising services were important for all students, not just those in academic trouble, and that good advising is an essential component in any effective retention program. Glennen (1983:59) commented, "An effective academic advisement program will be the prime factor in increasing student retention during the 1980s and 1990s." He also claimed that academic advising with emphasis on student satisfaction and retention would become the foremost weapon against declining enrollments.

The need for model academic advising programs and improved advising services is not new. Nationwide practices in academic advising were first surveyed by Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979). They found that the greatest need in two-year and four-year private colleges nationwide was the identification of a model for their academic advising system. This was the second greatest need in four-year public institutions.

Some gains were made by 1982 when the American College Testing Program repeated the survey, but researchers found that advisers were not evaluated at fifty percent of the responding institutions, and that advising programs were not systematically evaluated at seventy-six percent of the institutions (Winston et al., 1984). In forty-two percent of the institutions, advisers were expected to commit less that ten percent of their time to academic advising. However, over half of the institutions in 1982 did provided advisers with academic planning worksheets, an advising handbook, academic progress reports, a campus referral directory, and advisee academic profiles, consisting of prior academic records, ACT/SAT scores, high school transcripts, and placement test scores. Crockett (1983) found that those in charge of academic advising programs felt more readily available data on students, greater administrative recognition of advising, more effective evaluation of advisers and advising services, greater accountability for advising, and expanded adviser training were the greatest deficiencies in academic advising programs.

Institutions with highly successful persistence rates and learning outcomes, as indicated by the College Outcomes Measures Program scores, placed significantly more emphasis on academic advising and orientation than did institutions with less successful persistence rates according to Noel (1983). In contrast, the number of faculty with Ph.D.s, student-faculty ratio, library holdings, and accreditation had little impact on retention.

Burrell and Trombley (1983) surveyed undergraduate minority students in five colleges to determine the importance of student services. They found that students in four of the five colleges felt that academic advising was the most important service on campus, significantly more important than any of the other six areas considered. In contrast, Burrell and Trombley (1983) found that only forty-six percent of students felt that their advisers took a personal interest in them, and that twenty-two percent did not know who their academic advisers were.

Richards (1986) studied the outcomes of students who followed the recommendation of an adviser and those who did not at community colleges in Colorado. Advisers made recommendations concerning developmental or college courses in mathematics, writing, and reading, based on assessment tests. Of the students who followed the counsel of an adviser, eighty-two percent passed their freshman mathematics, writing, and reading courses, and seventy-five percent returned to the college the following year. Only fifty-five percent of those who did not follow the advise of an adviser passed their core courses, and less than sixty percent persisted to the second year.

Characteristics of Good Advisers

Good advising is generally the result of good advisers, and several researchers address the qualities that should be present in advisers. Good listening skills, availability to students, thorough knowledge about college policies and procedures, and a caring, genuine interest in students and academic advising activities (i.e., not see advising as merely a contract obligation or an intrusion in academic life) were listed by Ford (1988), Kishler (1986), Noel (1983), Purnell (1983), and Crockett (1982) as characteristics of outstanding advisers. Kishler (1986) felt that knowledge about institutional policies and procedures was the top prerequisite for academic advisers. Crockett (1983) found that students reported availability, dissemination of accurate information, and a personal, caring attitude to be the three most important qualities in an academic adviser.

Other factors were added to this list by various writers. Glennen (1983) found that student satisfaction in academic advising was a by-product of using advisers who were available and interested in advising, and having advisers who provided accurate and complete information. Ford (1988) found that good advisers were willing to refer their advisees to others when the student's need exceeded the adviser's expertise in a particular area. Good advisers also made an effort to understand the student's viewpoint, and were willing to help the student with both long-range planning as well as immediate or crisis problem solving. Ender and Winston (1982) also found that good advisers were willing to refer and were responsible role models, answered questions willingly, and were friendly and caring toward their advisees.

Purnell (1983) found that good advisers were patient with students, they questioned students about why a certain plan of action was desired, and they placed the needs of the student above the needs of the institution--particularly in course selection. Good advisers made students concentrate on objective results rather than subjective projections. They regularly based recommendations on the student's current academic record rather than the student's promises about future improvement. Good advisers also tried to accumulate as much background information about their advisees as possible to help in understanding their advisees and making sound recommendations to their advisees. Purnell found that good advisers provided clear, detailed explanations and were honest with students, that they were dependable and responsible for their advice and actions, and that they checked to see that students acted upon recommendations.

Kishler (1986) found that good advisers were knowledgeable about decision-making strategies, but did not make decisions for their advisees. Instead, they guided their advisees into making their own decisions based on sound reasoning. Noel (1983) added that good advisers motivated students to take action to help themselves.

Garnett (1988) studied the preferred adviser-advisee relationship from the student's perspective at the University of Central Arkansas. He found that students preferred the relationship to be centered on academic issues, the dispensing of accurate policy information, and traditional academic advising tasks. Students did not reject developmental advising styles, but did not consider them practical for faculty advisers, given the faculty-student ratio, teaching load, professional responsibilities, and lack of funding. The qualities most desired in the personal contact aspect of the relationship were that the adviser knew the student as a person (i.e., on a first name basis), was able to recognize the student in the halls, and took an active interest in advising.

Lumpkins and Hall (1987) studied differences between student's perception of the adviser's role and their actual experience with academic advisers. They found personal trust, sincere interest, and friendliness ranking among the five highest qualities in the student's perception of the adviser's role. Also ranking high in the perceived role of the adviser was the responsibility as an information source for institutional policies and procedures, scheduling, and program requirements. In contrast, students indicated that advisers did not fulfill these functions. Furthermore, twenty percent of the students surveyed said they did not trust their academic adviser. Lumpkins and Hall also felt that faculty training in advising techniques and responsibilities was greatly neglected in most colleges.

Responsibilities of Academic Advisers

Advising responsibilities are extensively discussed in the literature. Creamer and Atwell (1984) found four elements common to academic advising programs: student goal setting, educational and life planning, career development, and course selection. Understanding institutional policies and procedures, making decisions based on available information, and examining progress toward realization of academic and professional goals were the three student outcomes identified by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) as important to any academic advising program (Crockett, 1983).

Academic advising should not be personal or psychological counseling according to Crockett (1983); instead, the focus in academic advising should be on the student's integration into academic life, completion of academic requirements, and review of academic alternatives. Dunphy et al. (1987) pointed out that freshmen at Trenton State College went to advisers for academic and career advice, but not personal problems. In response to this, advisers were encouraged to make referrals to the counseling center for students with personal problems.

Frisz and Lane (1987) found that over two-thirds of students at the University of Northern Iowa who used advising services did so for one of three reasons: for information regarding college regulations and requirements (39%), for program planning and registration (13%), and for assistance in major or career decisions (17%). Warchal and Southern (1986) found that there was no significant difference in perceptions about important advising needs based on sex or age among college students. They found that choosing appropriate academic courses and programs, and improving job hunting and job search skills to be the only factors identified as "important" or "very important" in all age and gender categories.

Walsh (1985) studied the effects of a freshman program emphasizing academic planning, degree completion strategies, career exploration, class and study schedule planning, decision making, and familiarization with campus resources, services, rules, and policies. Participants were significantly more satisfied with college and had significantly higher GPAs than students in a control group. Similarly, Winston et al. (1984) found that advisers needed to provide advisees with procedural information about institutional policies and processes, course and program requirements, strategies for academic planning and goal-setting, career information and advice, and information about campus resources.

Ford (1988) listed adviser responsibilities at Houston Baptist University. Duties included helping students develop realistic goals, identifying special needs of individual students, referring students to available resources, assisting students with program planning, monitoring academic progress, and discussing career options. Ford pointed out that advisees should be held accountable for gathering relevant information, clarifying personal goals, becoming more knowledgeable about policies, procedures, and requirements, and accepting responsibility for academic and personal decisions.

Faculty and student participants in a workshop at Virginia Polytechnic Institute were asked to define the role of the academic adviser (Moore, Murphy, and Gore, 1985). The three most often suggested roles were that of providing information, giving advice, and providing emotional support. Other suggestions included being a good listener, serving as a parental substitute, providing reassurance, acting as a sounding board for ideas and decisions, and interpreting institutional policies. Participants also felt that advisers needed training in their role in student retention, successful advising techniques, registration procedures, and information about academic programs in other departments, campus resources, and placement services. A campus newsletter or computer information file was identified as an important tool for disseminating ongoing changes in institutional policy and updating advising information.

McMillian and McKinney (1985) listed guidelines for advisers at Oklahoma State University. These included setting office hours when the adviser would always be available to students, using computers and secretarial staff as much as possible for paperwork and recordkeeping, monitoring student progress--both positive and negative--and responding with written notes of concern, encouragement, or praise. Encouraging students to take responsibility for decisions, pointing out career options, helping students select courses relevant to their life goals, willingly making referrals, giving extra attention to special populations (i.e., minorities, honor students, high-risk students), making social contact with advisees, maintaining contact with the college placement office, and knowing the purpose and content of each course were also found to be important.

Purdy (1985) found that students rated advisers at Mercer County Community College highest on approachability, availability, and knowledgeability about college procedures. Students rated advisers lower on assistance with adjustments to college, discussion of goals and academic progress, knowledge of program requirements and any changes in requirements, and discussion of career plans. Students identified the college catalog and the pre-scheduling information booklet as the most helpful resources in academic advising. Purdy (1985) found that thirty-six percent of respondents met with their academic adviser only once during the year, twenty-nine percent met with an adviser twice, and eighteen percent never met with their adviser.

Larsen and Brown (1982) discussed student and faculty perceptions about what academic advising procedures should be followed. Over eighty percent of students said that the student should fill out his own registration forms and select his own courses once an adviser identified appropriate options. Ninety-four percent of students felt that advisers should be knowledgeable about the outlook for careers, while only seventy-two percent of advisers felt that this was important. An even greater contrast was found over the issue of whether or not advisers should inform students about their office hours: ninety percent of students felt advisers should, while only sixty-nine percent of the faculty agreed. Forty-eight percent of students said that an adviser should seek out a student who fails to come for an appointment, compared to thirty-six percent of faculty advisers who felt that they should go after such students. Over half of the students felt that an adviser should see an instructor about a student's low grades, while less than one third of advisers agreed.

Buhr, Pelletier, and Wark (1987) listed three objectives that should have been accomplished in the first or second advising session. The adviser should have encouraged students to focus their future discussions on educational and career plans. The adviser also needed to point out, and perhaps write out, the student's responsibilities in advising. These included establishing educational and career goals, reviewing course descriptions and requirements in the college catalog, obtaining published information from the library or academic offices, and having a list of possible alternatives in mind for each decision that needed to be made. Finally, the adviser needed to emphasize what expectations he had of the advisee, helping the advisee to see how the adviser expected him to participate in each subsequent advising session.

Phifer (1987) found that students often did not know how to make adequate decisions and that advisers needed to help them understand the progression that one goes through in making logical decisions. Phifer found that becoming aware of the need to make decisions, knowing one's life goals and making decisions directed toward those goals, making sure sufficient information has been collected to make a valid decision, and developing and implementing a plan of action once the decision has been made as the significant elements in making sound decisions. Winston et al. (1984) also found that students frequently do not understand the different stages in decision making and that advisers need to help their advisees become methodic in decision-making strategies. Similar to Phifer's comments, Winston et al. identified seeing the need for a decision, surveying the possible alternatives, acquiring adequate information about options, committing themselves to a plan of action, and then implementing the action as the common steps necessary to making adequate decisions. In contrast, many students preferred that the adviser simply make decisions for them.

Successful Academic Advising Models

Several academic advising models and specific techniques used at other institutions are discussed in the literature. Onofrio et al. (1988) described the advising system used at Morton College. New students completed placement tests and had an initial advising session prior to registration. At this session, the adviser reviewed institutional procedures with the student, including program requirements, GPA limits, the difference between fulltime and parttime enrollment, general education requirements, course prerequisites, and electives. During the semester, advisers were alerted to any student who planned to drop a course, who had a low GPA or was placed on academic probation at the end of the semester, or had excessive absences that might result in an administrative withdrawal. Onofrio et al. found that students who received advisement were significantly more knowledgeable about academic procedures and their own program requirements than those who did not receive advisement.

Cellucci and Price (1986) outlined a successful advising model used at Florence-Darlington Technical College. The model included the use of volunteer faculty advisers, rather than advising required for all faculty, adviser pre- and in-service training, emphasis on holistic counseling techniques, a monitoring system with grade reports every three weeks, student and adviser evaluation of the program, dissemination of complete student academic records to advisers, and updates sent to advisers regarding referral options.

Salamon, Hanebrink, and Commenator (1983) detailed the successful advising program implemented at New Hampshire College. They emphasized that the key to success in academic advising in private colleges was faculty and administrative cooperation. The program at New Hampshire included group meetings with the academic adviser during registration, individual interviews within the first three weeks of the semester, mid-term warnings for students with low GPAs, career planning and exploration discussions, and adviser-advisee social contact.

The Task Force on Student Flow Model at Mount Royal College (1987) recommended that institutions need to insure that every student can meet with an adviser before registration, that lists of advising assignments be well distributed and posted, that academic and personal data on students be distributed to advisers, that required courses be clearly identified and advisers furnished with graduation checklists, that class schedules be published well in advance of advising and registration, that pre-service orientation and training be provided for advisers, and that probation students be required to see an adviser regularly.

Some researchers addressed solutions to particular academic advising problems. Trinity Western College was experiencing problems with students waiting until the end of the registration period to acquire the needed adviser's signature on registration forms (Lyttle, 1985). Trinity instituted and publicized an advising week preceding the registration period to offset this problem. The registrar's office noted a significant improvement in pre-registration enrollment and fewer errors on registration forms.

Quezada and Jones-Loheyde (1984) found that students respond better when treated as unique individuals. They recommended that referrals be made to a person, not a department, that alternatives be discussed if the advisee seemed reluctant to follow-up on the referral, that advisers become personally familiar with services and organizations before making referrals, and that advisers make it a point to find out what the results of the referral have been.

Group Advising

One particular system found to be effective where staff allocations are limited is group advising. Crockett (1982) found that group advising was effective at several institutions. The primary benefit of this delivery system was that common information was distributed in a non-repetitious manner. This format was found to be most appropriate for information about registration procedures, general education requirements, and institutional procedures and policies. Lipschutz, Prola, and Stem (1985) found that students rated group advising significantly higher than they did individual advising.

York College in Jamaica, New York turned from all individual advising to a combination of group and individual advising due to financial exigency (Lipschutz, Prola, and Stem, 1985). Sixty new students met with two or three counselors, and the counselors concentrated their efforts on the most pressing needs of the whole group. These needs included strategies for choosing an appropriate program and selecting the right courses, completing registration procedures correctly, and identifying resources for getting help. To streamline the session, key information (e.g., college catalog, course schedule, abstracts of freshman courses, freshman handbook, etc.) was mailed to student one week before the session. The informal presentations were followed by a question and answer period.

Canisius College developed a mentoring program that utilized faculty and student advisers in group advising sessions to help new students acclimate to college life (Dunphy et al., 1987). Retention rates and GPAs of mentored students were found to be significantly higher than those of non-mentored students.

Intrusive Advising

Several techniques for resolving particular problems were discussed in the literature. Noel (1983) identified the first six weeks of the term as the most critical time for academic advising. Noel also found that only twenty-five percent of students were committed to their educational goals despite institutional interventions. The group in greatest danger of attrition was students who externally conformed to college life, but were undecided about future goals.

Advising for special populations has become a hallmark of successful academic advising programs. Students who are likely to experience poor grades or consider withdrawal from college are the primary targets of such programs. Duquense University concentrated their advising efforts on three groups: all freshmen, sophomores who were undecided about a major, and students with GPAs below 2.0 (Klepper, Nelson, and Miller, 1987). Fifty percent of students who left Duquense over a five-year period were freshmen, and forty-three percent of those leaving had GPAs below 2.0. In contrast, eighty-four percent of all entering freshmen at Duquense were in the upper two fifths of their high school graduating class. Kalna (1986) found that sixty percent of freshman were classified as high-risk, that thirty-four percent of high-risk students withdrew from college, and that high-risk students were responsible for eighty-five percent of the college's attrition.

Winston et al. (1984) identified that the need for adviser monitoring of advisees was greater for student athletes, those with major family responsibilities, students in performing arts, and those with responsibilities that precluded them from the social life of the institution than for other students. Grites (1982) found that student athletes responded well to direct instructions, since they were accustomed to taking similar orders from coaches. Polson (1985) recommended that gender and ethnicity be taken into consideration as much as possible when assigning advisers to special populations, explaining that advisees often open up and respond better to members of the same sex and race or ethnic background.

Grites (1982) discussed various advising techniques useful with populations with special academic needs. Students who lacked basic skills needed someone to regularly verify their progress. In addition, advisers needed to provide specific, detailed instructions, then verify that the instructions had been followed. Noel et al. (1985) found that most high-risk programs also utilize an early alert system for verifying class attendance, estimating grades, determining if assignments, quizzes, and tests had been completed to date, and providing recommendations and referrals for help.

Letchworth and Bleidt (1983) explained that the principal difference between intrusive and traditional counseling was that in the traditional approach, the student sought out the adviser and initiated the intervention, in the intrusive model, the counselor intervened in the student's life without request, often without the student's appreciation. Crockett (1983) emphasized that intrusive advisers must force contact between themselves and their advisees. Many of the students in the greatest trouble would not seek out an adviser for any reason. Frequent, high quality contact was necessary if high-risk students were to be reached.

Glennen (1983) discussed the effectiveness of intrusive advising, finding it responsible for a forty percent decline in freshman to sophomore attrition over an eight year period at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Similarly, Boyd et al. (1987) found that an intervention program, consisting of an initial interview, a behavioral contract, and a follow-up interview, had significant impact on transfer student performance. Forty-nine percent of students in the intervention group were in academically good standing during the semester of the intervention, compared to thirty-three percent of students in a control group.

Bland et al. (1987) studied the effectiveness of casual interventions with students at the University of Maryland, College Park, who had first semester GPAs below 2.0. Advising center staff members met individually with students to discuss possible reasons for the low grades and to suggest campus resources to help the student. They found that the experimental group had higher retention and better grades after receiving the treatment than did the control group, but that the difference was not significant. However, the mean GPA of students in the experimental group was above the 2.0 threshold for academic probation, while the mean GPA of students in the control group was not.

Hudesman et al. (1986) studied the outcome differences between a structured advising model and a nondirective model used with high-risk students at New York City Technical College. Both groups met individually with advisers a minimum of three times during each semester, but only the structured group had a specific agenda for each session. During the first session for students in the structured group, the adviser reviewed available services with the student, had the student set a GPA goal for the semester, and initiated an advising contract specifying meeting times and materials to be examined during the semester. At subsequent sessions, the student brought examinations, papers and other class materials to be reviewed by the adviser. Suggestions for improvement that were accepted by the student were incorporated into the advising contract. The mean GPA of students in the structured group was significantly higher than that of students in a control group each semester that the structured approach was utilized.

Sharkey et al. (1987) cited advising efforts to assist high-risk students at Canisius College, a small, liberal arts college with an eighty percent commuter population. Strategies included making student records immediately available to advisers through a computer database, regularly tracking estimated grades, and sending official notices to students with excessive absences or low grades, informing them of the need to see an adviser. Retention from freshman to sophomore year for high-risk, non-traditional students rose from twenty percent to forty-nine percent during the decade after the advising program was implemented.

The Canisius program included a specific agenda for the first advising session, computerized progress reports, and an early warning system (Sharkey et al., 1987). At the first advising session, advisers gave students time to express their concerns and ask questions, then advisers discussed the course offerings and available student services with the student. Finally, the adviser and student worked out an appropriate class schedule together. Grades for high-risk students were regularly entered into a computer database, so that advisers and students could access a current estimated grade for a course through any campus computer.

Eight weeks into the semester faculty submitted the names of students with excessive absences or those who were failing or nearly failing courses to the academic office. The registrar, in turn, notified the student to see an academic adviser. The faculty report included the student's current grade, means of determining the grade (quizzes, papers, exams, etc.), any needs for tutoring in writing, reading, mathematics, or the specific subject matter of the course, and opportunity for the faculty member to make general comments about the student's work and progress.

Cellucci and Price (1986) attributed a twenty-six percent superiority in the retention rates of an experimental advising group over that of a control group at Jefferson Community College to intrusive advising. Techniques applied in the experimental model included adviser in-service training in advising techniques and procedures, adviser monitoring of student progress, and intervention for students experiencing academic difficulty. Cellucci and Price also cited the intrusive advising system at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, as responsible for a forty percent reduction in freshman to sophomore attrition during an eight-year period.

Johnson (1986) detailed construction of an intrusive advising model for students on academic probation. The design included adviser-student discussions about educational goals, a review of institutional policies and restrictions pertaining to academic progress, regular meetings with the adviser, a student-adviser contract, student progress monitoring by the adviser, dissemination of academic information from the registrar's office to academic advisers, assistance in decision making, and referrals to other academic support personnel and student services.

In this program, advisers sent letters to academic probation students (GPA below 2.0) during the first week of the semester, requesting a meeting. Advisers made a second contact by letter or telephone call to those students who did not initially respond. The registrar provided academic advisers with complete academic records on each advisee, and advisers were instructed to keep a log of their contact with advisees, documenting any discussion, decisions, or referrals that came out of those meetings.

At mid-term, advisers received progress reports on probationary students from the director of academic advising, and were directed to meet with these students and to see instructors if additional information was needed. The purpose of these follow-up meetings was to provide positive reinforcement for progress and to discuss and decide on alternative actions where progress was unsatisfactory. At the end of the semester, the adviser sent a letter of congratulations to those who improved, and a letter to those who did not to remind them of the institution's policy on satisfactory progress, emphasizing the availability of the adviser and other campus resources useful in improving academic performance.

Cellucci and Price (1986) found positive results after implementation of an intrusive advising model at Western New

Mexico University in 1982. An eighteen percent decline in attrition was recorded the following year. Significantly higher freshmen credit hour completion rates and higher GPAs during the four years after the program was implemented were also noted.

Glennen, Baxley, and Farren (1985) discussed the impact that the Western New Mexico advising model had on minority retention and academic performance. Minority students in academic trouble were unwilling to participate in the previous advising system, and the university had experienced a sixty-five percent rate of attrition among minorities from their freshman to sophomore fall semesters. In the design of the new system, all freshmen and all sophomores who had not declared a major were required to participate in academic advising. After three years of implementation, the university recorded a twenty-five percent reduction in minority attrition from the freshman to sophomore fall semesters, and an increase in the number of minority students achieving the deans list.

Components of the Western New Mexico system included a summer training program for advisers, a centralized location for adviser-advisee meetings, ready access to academic records and test scores for advisers, frequent advising sessions for high-risk students, and a minimum of two sessions per semester for all students, information about support services, and increased adviser-student contact when poor grades or poor class attendance was reported.

Glennen, Baxley, and Farren (1985) also pointed out that in successful intrusive advising, it must be possible for the student, the adviser, or the advising office to call for an advising session, that students must be made aware of support services before they start experiencing problems rather than after problems arise, and that advisers need to send follow-up letters or make telephone calls to make contact with any student who fails to show up for an advising appointment.

Lyons (1985) detailed the intrusive advising program used at Moravian College, a small, liberal arts college in eastern Pennsylvania. The one-semester program included weekly group meetings, a five-week test anxiety workshop, assessment in learning and study skills, adviser promotion of advisee self-esteem, and identification and implementation of specific behavioral changes needed to improve study habits. The group receiving the treatment completed the first semester with a 2.50 mean GPA, while a random control group achieved a mean GPA of 1.97. Though not as dramatic, the differences in GPAs continued to be significant for later semesters. There were also significant differences in retention and graduation rates between the experimental and control groups.

Letchworth and Bleidt (1983) studied the effects of an intrusive advising system for students on academic probation at Youngstown State University. Students in the experimental group were required to participate in a single thirty-minute interview with an academic adviser. Most of the interaction time was spent on identifying sources for assistance and making referrals. Letchworth and Bleidt found that the experimental groups had higher GPAs and better retention rates than the control group, but the differences were not significant. They suggested that the single contact was insufficient to produce significant improvement.

Grites (1982) pointed out that one special population often neglected in advising programs is that of high school honor students. Honor students may need special help in learning to accept minor failures and to open up to alternatives. Because of their high level of academic success in high school, these students often identify with singular choices in life, rather than seeing options when one possibility is eliminated.

In contrast, Moore (1987) found that the skills needed for advising international students were the same as those required for advising domestic students. Both required an awareness of cultural differences between the home environment and that of the college. With international students these differences were simply more pronounced. Moore found that the dominant needs of international students related to college requirements, financial aid, class schedules, grades, social activities and relationships, career choices, changes in living accommodations, and homesickness--typical counseling needs of domestic students as well.

Adviser Training

Noel et al. (1985) indicated that the two most important factors in successful academic advising were administrative support and encouragement for academic advising duties and pre- and in-service training for advisers. Winston et al. (1984) found academic advising to be an administrative function that should be measured by how well student needs are met. It functioned best when advisers were volunteers, systematically trained in advising techniques and institutional policies. Winston et al. (1984) also recommended that institutions interested in upgrading from an advising program that was merely course registration to one that truly met students needs should appoint an individual responsible for developing and implementing a pilot program. Crockett (1983) likewise emphasized the need for a single person responsible for overseeing advising, finding that when everyone shared advising responsibilities equally, there was no accountability.

Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987) outlined guidelines for the effective advising system, including setting clear expectations of advisers, appointment of an individual responsible for administrating the program, integrating orientation and assessment into advising, and providing in-service training for advisers. Winston et al. (1984) suggested that adviser training should include instruction in academic policies and practices at the institution, decision-making strategies, short- and long-range planning, interpersonal skills, cultural adaptation, and developmental skills.

Crockett (1983) pointed out that faculty advisers did not come in contact with institutional policies on a daily basis as did institutional administrators, and so could not be expected to have all the necessary information pertaining to students in their heads. Faculty advisers needed support materials regularly developed and distributed to them. Adviser training should include the use of appropriate handout materials, presentations by campus experts on basic counseling skills, and dissemination of information about course offerings, core requirements, referral resources, and administrative forms and procedures. Tacha (1986) found that few faculty members were adequately prepared to provide general advising services, particularly in registration procedures. Tacha recommended that faculty who were interested in students, but not inclined toward academic policies and procedures, should serve as mentors and tutors for upperclassmen and gifted students, and that the other academic services be delegated to academic counselors. Crockett (1983) likewise emphasized that faculty advising systems had many obstacles to overcome: faculty tended to be subject-oriented and lack institution-wide knowledge and information, were not interested in advising and gave it low priority among their professional activities (especially when advising, unlike teaching and research activities, had little impact on promotion), and were often inaccessible.

Michigan State University applied three strategies in its attempt to improve academic advising services: an institution-wide in-service training program for advisers, newsletter to update advisers about relevant changes in policy, procedures, and programs, and a committee to maintain efforts in improving advising services (Kishler, 1985). The advising newsletter was used to supplement adviser training by keeping advisers informed about changing institutional policies, cut-off dates for dropping courses, registration procedures, and changes in specific programs and majors. In addition, much information about appropriate advising techniques to be used with freshmen and undecided students was included. The successful newsletter was published in three or more issues each academic year.

Materials for Academic Advising

The literature also includes significant references to the importance of developing materials for academic advising. Advisers surveyed at the University of North Dakota indicated that one of the greatest deficiencies in academic advising was a lack of materials (Schubert and Munski, 1985). Information was needed in advising strategies, assessment procedures and interpretation of test results, advising policies and procedures, general education requirements, and available support services.

Academic advisers at Houston Baptist University received an advising handbook, list of characteristics of good advisers, outline of advising responsibilities, information about effective study techniques and time management, and guidelines for advising students in various disciplines and students with special needs. The handbook also included a section of common advising questions and the corresponding answers about dropping classes, changing from pass-fail to alphabetic grades, dealing with students not on class lists, and serving students who want to withdraw (Ford, 1988).

Colorado Mountain College developed a database of course requirements to assist academic advisers. Information for the database was gathered through a standard questionnaire that was sent to each course instructor. The database included reading requirements, number and length of written assignments, type and number of examinations, type and number of quizzes for each course. Prerequisite levels in mathematics or English, disciplinary course prerequisites, proportion of classroom time spent in lecture, discussion, group work, and other learning experiences were also listed for each course (Hadden, 1988).

Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987) emphasized that administrators needed to provide advisers with ample student and procedural information, including academic and personal data on advisees and accurate information about academic programs, financial aid, institutional policies, procedures relating to registration and graduation, and college and community resources for referral. Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova also supported the use of course requirement sheets to inform advisers and students of the specific expectations and requirements for available courses. Completed by the course instructor, these forms were used to collect the same information that was collected at Colorado Mountain College. In addition, requisite skills in library research, information about laboratory and field work, and factors common to students who had been unsuccessful in the course in the past were compiled for each course offered.

Among the materials helpful to advisers are pre-enrollment data. Pre-enrollment characteristics have become a useful resource in identifying potential high-risk students. Kelly and White (1986) reviewed the Freshman Testing, Counseling and Advising Profile used by Penn State University for over thirty years. Academic information was taken from official records, including high school GPA and class rank, SAT scores, academic major, choice of major, and placement test scores (English, mathematics, and chemistry). The official records data were supplemented by a self-reported student questionnaire identifying parental educational level, study habits, predicted college grades, reactions to high school courses, educational plans, and reasons for attending Penn State. As much academic information as possible was taken from official records, since students tended to inflate grades and test scores when self-reported. Louisiana State University implemented a modified form of Penn State's student database in 1987 (Garnett, 1988).

Klepper, Nelson, and Miller (1987) found a similar system at Canisius College. Administrators at Canisius felt the profile was the most important resource they had for retention analysis and identification of students needing special assistance. In addition to elements found in the Penn State profile, the Canisius database included student participation in on-campus clubs and athletic teams, honors and awards, a student employment record, a financial aid profile, and record of participation in the college orientation program. Higbee and Dwinell (1988) included high school GPA, separate high school GPAs in English and mathematics, SAT verbal andmathematics scores, placement tests in English and mathematics, and reasons for attending college in their model for profiling and assisting high-risk students.

Glennen (1983) emphasized the need to provide advisers with a complete set of academic records on each advisee, including the student's application, admission and placement test scores, high school and previous college transcripts, and admissions correspondence. Student enrollment data, including demographic characteristics, should be collected and distributed to advisers by the fourth week of class according to Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987).

Background Factors in Advising New Students

Several background factors have been identified in the literature as having an effect on academic performance and student retention. Since new students lack an objective record of college achievement, advisers must turn to other resources in identifying students in need of special care. Furthermore, new students may experience greater lifestyle transitions than returning students and may be more susceptible to discouragement and withdrawal from college. Ender (1987) found that effective intervention was possible only when high-risk students were identified prior to enrollment, and that regular, continuing contact between adviser and student was a prerequisite for a successful academic advising program. Consequently, advisers at PBTS would benefit from knowing what factors have been associated with poor performance and attrition at other institutions, and paying special attention to new students with similar characteristics.

Some researchers have suggested that all new students be regarded as high-risk advisees, since many freshman have unrealistic expectations about college. Kelly and White (1986) found that ninety-six percent of freshmen expected a B average or better by the end of the freshman year. Some of these students had never received a B or higher throughout their four years in high school. Two-year students were more likely to have unrealistic grade expectations than four-year students. The majority of incoming freshmen thought that college study time might require up to twenty hours per week. Astin et al. (1988) found that the average high school grade attained by over half of new college students nationwide was an A or B. These students often assumed that college work and the resulting grades would be similar.

Students who make late application to college or are undecided about a major may not perform as well as their peers. Hudesman et al. (1985) found that the ability to plan ahead was distinctly related to academic performance and graduation rates. Healy and Mourton (1987) and Blustein et al. (1986) found that GPA and career development skills were highly related. Polson (1985) found that having identified a major had a significant impact on GPA, regardless of high school rank or GPA or SAT/ACT score. Winston et al. (1984) found that underprepared students were more likely to experience difficulties in educational planning, were inclined to make late decisions about college and life, were more likely to be economically disadvantaged, experienced higher stress and anxiety in college, and did not tend to seek professional advise. Chatman (1986) found that students who applied for college admission closer to the beginning of the fall semester had lower SAT scores than those who applied early in the year.

Undecided students may be particularly susceptible to early withdrawal. Noel et al. (1985) found that uncertainty about a college major or career choice was one of the two major factors resulting in attrition, and that it was the principal reason good students drop out. Kelly and White (1986) and Noel et al. (1985) found that over three-quarters of entering freshmen were uncertain about their choice of major. Absence of goal clarity is one of the key issues contributing to student withdrawal according to Tinto (1987). Sandusky (1987) found that students who did not declare a major were more likely to have low first semester GPAs and were significantly more likely to withdraw from school during the first year.

Advisers of students in the one-year program at PBTS may experience a greater demand for assistance from their advisees. Kroll (1989a) studied the academic performance differences between students in the one-year program and those in the three-year program. A significant difference in both the mean grades of the two groups and the pass-fail ratio was identified, with three-year students faring much better than one-year students. This difference was consistently found for each of the four years included in the study.

Employment during the school year can have a major impact on the academic performance and persistence of students. The U.S. Labor Department reported that forty-seven percent of fulltime college students held jobs while in school ("Notebook," 1989). In contrast, Kroll (1990) found that sixty percent of new students at PBTS planned to work while in school. The Maryland Longitudinal Study Steering Committee (MLSSC, 1987) and Winston et al. (1984) both found that students who withdrew from college before completing a program were more likely to hold a job while attending college than were other students.

Minority students, especially on a predominantly white campus like PBTS, may need additional attention from academic advisers. Pounds (1987) attributed problems with minority retention and academic performance on predominantly white campuses to underdeveloped prior academic skills, less satisfaction with college, and feelings of isolation and alienation. Hudesman et al. (1986) found that eighty-five percent of students requiring special, high-risk services at New York City Technical College were minorities. Martin and Brown (1986) found that the rate in similar programs at Rockland Community College was 89.3 percent minorities. Ott (1988), Metzner and Bean (1987), Winston et al. (1984), and Pascarella et al. (1981) also found higher attrition and lower achievement among minority college students. Advisers may need to take special care with minority advisees to insure that poor performance and attrition are minimal.

Winston et al. (1984) identified that first-generation college students experienced greater obstacles in achieving success in college, often because family and friends did not support their decision to attend college. Martin and Brown (1986) found that one-third of students enrolled in a special program for high-risk students were first-generation college students. MLSSC (1987) also found first-generation college students to be more susceptible to early withdrawal from college.

Moores and Klas (1989) found on-campus residence to be significantly related to retention, with seventy-one percent of residence hall students remaining in school after two semesters, compared to thirteen percent of commuters. Nettles, Thoeny, and Gosman (1986) associated living in on-campus housing with high college GPAs, and MLSSC (1987) found living off-campus, either in one's own apartment or with parents, to be related to attrition. Balunas (1986) found that students who live with their parents had lower GPAs than those who lived on their own.

Tinto (1988) explained that commuter student did not experience the separation from their former social group that residence hall students did. Because commuters never made the social bond to college life, they were often outsiders to the social and academic group structure of the campus. They were further inclined to withdrawal or inadequate performance by greater exposure to external forces and responsibilities that drew them away from college life.

Students who did not take a college preparation program in high school may experience greater difficulty competing in college courses. Dodge (1989) found students who completed four years of English and three years each of mathematics, natural science, and social studies in high school had significantly higher ACT scores than did other students. The American College Testing Program (1986) also found that students who did not take college preparation programs in high school had significantly lower ACT scores than those who did. MLSSC (1987) found that taking a college prepatory program in high school was positively correlated to persistence to graduation in college.

Two of the most beneficial tools used by academic advisers to assess the need for intervention were the advisee's high school academic record and ACT or SAT scores. Relationships between these factors and academic performance in college and student retention have been well documented in the literature. Moores and Klas (1989), Metzner and Bean (1987), Moores and Klas (1989), MLSSC (1987), Sandusky (1987), Syarif and Harris (1987), Tracey and Sedlacek (1987), Nettles, Thoeny, and Gosman (1986), and Thornell and Jones (1986) found correlations between high school grades and college performance and persistence. Ott (1988), Nettles, Syarif and Harris (1987), Tracey and Sedlacek (1987), Thoeny, and Gosman (1986), Kalna (1986), and Thornell and Jones (1986) found correlations between ACT/SAT scores and college performance and persistence.

Kroll (1989b) found that a significant number of students who entered PBTS from fall 1985 to spring 1989 had low ACT/SAT scores or low high school GPAs. The retention rate for students with very low ACT scores or high school GPAs was significantly lower than that of their peers.

These students were also significantly more likely to have college GPAs below 2.0.

Evaluation of Academic Advising

Evaluation of advisers and advising systems was also treated in the literature. Although adviser self-evaluation and administrative evaluation of advisers were beneficial, Crockett (1983) found that student evaluation of advising was the most important form of evaluation, since the advisees are the end recipients of advising services. Crockett further pointed out that a well-designed evaluation program should determine how well the advising system worked, should obtain information to improve individual adviser performance, should identify areas of weakness in advising for in-service training sessions, should provide identification of superior advisers for administrative recognition, and should gather data for improving administrative support for the advising program.

A variety of scales and evaluation criteria were used by different institutions. Polson (1985) identified that most academic advising evaluation instruments were institution-specific questionnaires designed to measure satisfaction with advising. Three components were typical: evaluation of the relationship between adviser and student, including teaching/advising techniques and accuracy of information-giving, frequency of advising interaction, and satisfaction with aspects of advising.

The University of California-Davis evaluated advising services with a numerical scale corresponding to descriptors from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" (Amos, 1988). Advising services, availability of the adviser, and the value of information provided by the adviser were evaluated. Demographic difference in satisfaction were analyzed for men/women, academic class, and discipline.

Heller (1989) listed elements of a faculty survey developed for evaluating good teaching practices outside the classroom. Statements were rated on a scale from "very often" to "never." Statements included the adviser's availability, knowledge of students by their first name by the second week of the semester, special efforts to be available to culturally diverse students, mentoring and informal contact with advisees, assistance in resolving student-institutional policy conflicts, and career advising.

Purdy (1985) studied adviser effectiveness at Mercer County Community College in New Jersey. The evaluation of advisers consisted of a student survey of how regularly activities occurred, rated on a scale from "all the time" to "not at all." Survey items included adviser approachability, helpfulness in adjustments to college life, the extent to which the adviser discussed academic goals and progress with the student, assistance with career exploration, and knowledge about program requirements and changes, college policies and procedures, registration processes, and referral resources.

Trombley (1984) developed a twenty-six item student survey to evaluate advisers and advising services. The survey used a five-point scale with descriptors from "performed well" to "performed poorly." Survey items included statements about keeping track of academic progress, helping the student select appropriate courses, knowing program requirements, improving decision-making processes, helping the student negotiate registration procedures, providing explanations of college policies and requirements. Items about encouraging the student to talk about concerns, helping the student find answers to questions, extending friendship, giving information about helpful resources, helping to clarify educational goals and career options, being available to meet with the student, suggesting ways to improve study habits were also included.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The development, implementation, and evaluation of an academic advising model at PBTS was conducted over a ten-month period from July 1989 through April 1990. The first component of the project was a review of related literature to identify techniques, materials, system models, and evaluation methods found effective at other colleges. A system design was developed, and a proposal to implement the model was submitted to the president and the vice-president for academic affairs. A prerequisite for the system was that it must not require additional personnel or funding to implement than was available under the former structure. Fundamental components of the model included formal training for advisers, the development of materials to aid in advising tasks, dissemination of student records data to advisers, an intrusive component for advising and monitoring high-risk students, revised registration and pre-registration procedures, and appointment of an advising coordinator to oversee implementation of the project. The proposal was approved in July 1989.

Development of Advising Support Materials

Various materials were developed prior to the fall semester as tools to assist advisers in their tasks.

Program requirement checklists were already supplied to advisers to keep track of each advisee's completion of program requirements, and each adviser was expected to have a copy of a current catalog, but no other materials were previously available. The following new materials were developed and distributed to advisers in August 1989. Examples of each product are included in Appendix A.

> Weekly schedule. Developed to provide students and advisers with a blank format for planning out an entire week of class, study, work, and leisure time. This five-day planner included time slots for the regular class day and sufficient space to add the remainder of weekly activities and to customize the schedule.
>
> Program planning worksheet. Designed to allow advisers and students to list and project what courses the student would take in future semesters. Space was provided for four years of fall, spring, and summer terms, plus other courses (correspondence and transfer courses, etc.) and student ministry assignment.
>
> Grade estimate sheet. Developed as a vehicle for advisers to acquire currently estimated grades and attendance records about each high-risk advisee. It included space for an estimated grade in each course, the percentage of the final grade completed to date, current number of absences, notations about late work, and initials of the instructor to verify the source of the information.
>
> Course requirement summary. Created to provide advisers and students with a one-page synopsis of the requirements for each course offered in the coming semester. It included reading requirements, number of quizzes and examinations, amount of research work, prerequisites, instructor-perceived reasons why some students performed poorly in the class, and estimated cost of books and materials.
>
> Advising contract. Designed to provide advisers and high-risk advisees with a formal agreement outlining expectations for the semester. Space was provided for the expected number of

study hours per week, academic and employment restrictions, advising sessions, reporting of estimated grades, and other elements as agreed upon by the adviser and student.

New student profile. Consisting of two instruments, the academic record profile and the new student questionnaire, the profile provided advisers with background on the academic, personal, and demographic characteristics of each of their new advisees.

Adviser Training

Two one-hour adviser training sessions and two half-hour session were planned and implemented by the project designer. The first was a one-hour pre-service session held during the week before the beginning of the fall 1989 term. It consisted of a brief presentation on the importance of quality advising and the results of quality advising at other institutions, an overview of new advising materials and procedures, instruction on how to be an effective adviser, and training in intrusive advising techniques for high-risk students. The materials in Appendix A were distributed and discussed at this session. In addition, the characteristics of good advisers and intrusive advising handouts in Appendix B were distributed as a written reminder for adviser.

The second one-hour adviser training session was conducted approximately three weeks after the beginning of the fall semester. It consisted of four basic components. Advising deficiencies identified through the pre-implementation evaluations were presented, and strategies to address these deficiencies were discussed and incorporated into the advising model. A summary profile of the academic, personal, and demographic characteristics of new students was distributed, and advisers were instructed in ways to interpret and utilize the profile to better understand and help individual advisees with particular backgrounds. Advisers were instructed in decision-making strategies and encouraged to involve their advisees in methodical decision making as part of the advising process. The session closed with a question and answer period and a discussion about implementation of the advising model. At this session, advisers were provided with the summary profile of new students in Appendix B. Advisers had already received individual profiles on each of their new advisees at registration.

The third training session was a half-hour review of pre-registration procedures, conducted in mid-November, shortly before the start of the pre-registration period. Advisers were provided with pre-registration materials and instructed in appropriate activities for the group advising sessions, planned to streamline pre-registration for students taking the regular fulltime course load. Previously, all pre-registration had been done by individual appointments. The pre-registration information handout in Appendix B was distributed to advisers at this session, and sent to all students the same day through on-campus mailboxes.

An additional half-hour session was conducted in January to provide a brief review of procedures. Although no new procedures were added, this session primarily served to remind advisers about techniques, procedures, and materials that were utilized during the fall semester and should continue to be used in the spring semester.

Implementation of New Procedures

Several new or modified procedures were implemented through the trial model. Advisers were asked to integrate procedures that had been presented in the training sessions into their advising processes for two semesters (September 1989 through April 1990). The following specific procedures were asked of advisers or administratively implemented to support advisers in completion of new tasks.

An advising file was established and placed in the library. The file was regularly stocked throughout the implementation period with copies of the worksheets in Appendix A. Additional items were added to the file, including a current class schedule, list of advising assignments, list of regular office hours for each adviser, program requirement information, copies of announcements about currently available student ministries, and completed course summaries for courses in the current and upcoming semesters. These materials and supplies were placed in the library for easy adviser and student access. The library was selected as the distribution center because most faculty offices are in the library building, and the library is the only campus office with evening and weekend hours. The availability of materials was regularly publicized through announcements in the student newspaper and notices on campus bulletin boards. In addition, advisers were individually supplied with copies of the course requirement summaries for each course and multiple copies of the worksheets in Appendix A prior to the beginning of the fall semester.

Tentative advising assignments, based on the student's declared program and concentration, were made prior to fall registration and sent to advisers. Assignments were adjusted at registration for students who changed their major since their last contact with the institution. Under the previous system, advising assignments were made during the second or third week of the fall semester, and new students met with the first available adviser. Under the trial model, all students stopped at the advising coordinator's table in the registration line to confirm their advising assignment, then met with the individual who would be their adviser for the year. New students were taken by a staff member and personally introduced to their new adviser.

The logistics of fall registration was also modified. Previously, advisers were integrated into the registration line in the gymnasium. Under the new system, advisers were placed in temporary offices at one side of the gymnasium, spatially separated from the noise and activity of the registration line at the other side of the gymnasium. Advisers were separated from one another by portable wall dividers for counseling privacy.

Academic advisers were provided with individual student profiles on each of their new advisees (see the academic record profile and the new student questionnaire in Appendix A) at registration. Further interpretation and use of this information was discussed at the second adviser training session in mid-September. Advisers were asked to use this information to make themselves aware of any potential difficulties that their advisees may experience, and to make their advising contacts more personal by demonstrating greater knowledge about the advisee's interest, goals, and background. Under the previous system, no academic or personal information was provided to advisers.

Advisers were asked to meet with all of their advisees at least twice during each semester. To encourage contact, complimentary coffee and donuts for informal group advising sessions in the student center were arranged. Regular office hours were also solicited from each adviser and posted in the library, on the faculty and academic affairs bulletin boards, and in the student center. A copy was also placed in the student-accessible advising file in the library.

Students were previously responsible for selecting and acquiring an appropriate student ministry on their own.

The director of student ministries checked to see that the student's selection was in keeping with a list of departmentally-approved assignments. Under the new system, students discussed appropriate student ministry opportunities with their adviser, and the adviser submitted recommended assignments to the director of student ministries. Advisers were also supplied with copies of their advisees' student ministry evaluations and were asked to counsel their advisees about evaluation comments.

Adviser's received mid-term grades for all advisees with a cumulative GPA below 2.0 or any individual course grade below C, and were asked to counsel these student about academic problems and strategies for improvement. In previous years, advisers did not receive mid-term grades. Advisers were also supplied with course drop slips and academic petition forms. Drop slips were not made available to students from the academic office to insure that students consulted their advisers before dropping a course.

In the past, advisers were given no specific instructions for dealing with high-risk advisees. During the trial model implementation, advisers were asked to meet with all advisees who were on academic probation at least once a month, with the first meeting in the first three weeks of the fall term. They were also asked to draw up a written advising contract and to hold students to the terms of the agreement. Advisers were encouraged to request frequent estimated grades and attendance reports for high-risk advisees. Unlike previous years in which the academic dean notified students of changes in their academic probation status, notification letters were sent on behalf of advisers to students who went on, went off, or continued on academic probation. Advisers were asked to include a personal note of encouragement to the student in the letter.

Pre-registration for the upcoming semester was the major function of academic advising at PBTS in the past. All pre-registration was completed through individual appointments between adviser and advisee, and consisted of selecting the appropriate courses and completing registration forms. Since some required courses at PBTS were offered on rotation, advisers were furnished with the regular fulltime course load for each semester, a listing of courses that should be taken in a particular year and program to insure completion of graduation requirements on time and without scheduling conflicts (see the pre-registration handout in Appendix B).

To streamline the pre-registration process and to eliminate redundancy in completing forms, a group advising session was added to pre-registration. Both students and advisers were given copies of the regular fulltime course load shortly before the start of the pre-registration period. At a group advising session, students who planned to take the regular fulltime course load completed their registration forms together. The forms were then collected, reviewed by the adviser, and submitted to the academic office for processing. The adviser used the remainder of the group session to address common concerns and to set appointments to meet with those students who did not plan to take the regular fulltime course load to work out an acceptable class schedule.

System Evaluation, Instrumentation, and Data Collection

Two twenty-five item questionnaires were developed and used as a pretest-posttest evaluation of adviser and student satisfaction with advising. The pretest evaluation was conducted before the start of the fall 1989 semester. Although the number of items on the two questionnaires was the same, the content of specific items on the surveys was different. One questionnaire addressed the satisfaction of the ten faculty advisers with the academic advising system used in the 1988-89 academic year, and was administered to the advisers at a mid-August meeting. The second questionnaire was administered at the beginning of fall registration to all students returning in the fall 1989 term who were enrolled at PBTS during the 1988-89 academic year (approximately 60 students) to determine their level of satisfaction with the status quo.

Both student and adviser questionnaires were administered again at a group assembly in late March 1990 to assess satisfaction with the trial model. The assembly was required for both advisers and students. The timing of the posttest corresponded with pre-registration for the fall semester, the last major advising responsibility of the year.

A six-step rating scale from "very poor" to "excellent" was used for each of the twenty-five items on the two surveys. Previous evaluation instruments at PBTS and evaluation items discussed in the literature were used as the basis for the questionnaires, and the instruments were reviewed for validity and appropriateness to PBTS by the vice-president for academic affairs. Pretest and posttest versions of the respective questionnaires were identical, except that a statement was added to each to identify the year being evaluated. The post-implementation versions of the questionnaires are included in Appendix C.

Identification of respondents was necessary for pretest-posttest correlation. Advisers were asked to place their names on their questionnaires. The name of the student's adviser, the student's major and academic year classification were asked for on the student questionnaire. Since the number of students assigned to each adviser was small, this information, coupled with a comparison of handwriting on the questionnaires, was satisfactory for correlating matched pairs without sacrificing student anonymity.

An additional twenty-six item survey was appended to the post-implementation evaluation to identify both adviser and student preferences between elements of the previous advising structure and the advising model implemented during the 1989-90 academic year. Former and new procedures were briefly stated and identified as "A" or "B" rather than by year to insure that responses were based solely on procedural preferences, rather than recollection of which year was preferred. Listing procedures in this fashion also made it possible to have new students identify their preferences as well. The advising preferences survey was given to all advisers and all students (both returning and new). Respondents were asked to indicate their preferences in procedures on a five-step scale from "strongly prefer A" to "strongly prefer B." A sample of this questionnaire is also included in Appendix C.

Treatment of Data

Responses to the questionnaires were entered into a computer database for analysis. Pretest responses of students who did not return in the spring semester and posttest responses of students who did not complete a pretest questionnaire were included in the preliminary identification of items rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of students, but omitted from all other analyses. All remaining pretest-posttest results were based on responses of the pretest-posttest sample. Items left blank were treated as "not applicable." If a respondent circled more than one number for a particular item, the mean value, rounded to the nearest integer, was recorded.

Pretest items which were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of advisers or over ten percent of returning students were identified. The responses were discussed at the mid-September adviser training session as areas in need of special attention. These items were also compared to items on the posttest that were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of advisers or ten percent of returning students.

The frequency distribution, median, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for each item on the adviser and returning student evaluations. Comparisons were then made between the mean results of the pretest and posttest evaluations for each item on the questionnaires. Pretest-posttest comparisons were separately made for advisers and returning students. Comparisons of individual pretest-posttest responses were also made to assess increases, decreases, and no change in the level of personal satisfaction.

The dependent t-test was selected as the statistical test for all pretest and posttest comparisons. Significance was measured at the .05 level. Since it was desirable to consider both gains and losses in adviser and student satisfaction, two-tailed tests were utilized in all analyses.

The dependent t-test necessitated both pretest and posttest scores for each individual in the study; consequently, any questionnaire response with a numerical rating that lacked a paired numerical rating (i.e., no response or "not applicable") was dropped from the test of significance, and the sample size was adjusted accordingly for that item. All responses were included in the reporting of frequency distribution, median, mean, and standard deviation statistics, however.

The advising preferences survey was administered to all advisers and all students (both returning and new students) during the same assembly that the posttest evaluation was conducted. Identical forms were distributed to advisers and students. The Frequency distribution, median, mean, and standard deviation were separately calculated for advisers, all students, returning students, and new students. Since the extreme ends of the scales reflected the strongest preferences, all items with mean ratings of 4.0 or greater or 2.0 or less on the five-point evaluation scale were arbitrarily noted as significant preferences for advisers, all students, returning students, and new students, respectively.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

There were 139 day college students assigned to the ten academic advisers for the fall 1989 semester, and 130 day college students for the spring 1990 semester. Returning students accounted for seventy-three of the students in the fall and sixty of the students in the spring. Sixty-six of the students assigned to advisers in the fall 1989 semester were classified as new students. This included students who had previously attended PBTS but were not enrolled during the 1988-89 academic year. Seventy students who did not attend PBTS during the 1988-89 academic year were enrolled in the spring 1990 semester.

Usable advising evaluation forms were completed by fifty-eight returning students at the fall 1989 registration. Fifty-five evaluations were completed by returning students (those enrolled during the 1988-89 academic year) at a required assembly on March 29, 1990. Ten faculty members were responsible for providing academic advising during both the 1988-89 and 1989-90 academic years. Questionnaires were distributed to and returned from all of these advisers at a faculty meeting in August 1989 (evaluating the 1988-89 year) and at the required assembly in March 1990 (evaluating the 1989-90 year).

Items which were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of returning students or ten percent of academic advisers were identified and discussed at one of the in-service training sessions. Three areas were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of returning students: adviser encouraging the student to talk about problems, adviser making the student aware of support services at the college, and adviser being available to meet with the student as often as desired. Five additional areas were rated "poor" or "very poor" by 8.6 percent of all returning students. Seventeen of the twenty-five items on the student pretest evaluation were found acceptable by over ninety-three percent of all returning day college students in the fall 1989 semester.

Sixteen of the items on the adviser pretest evaluation were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of academic advisers. Knowledge of prior abilities and interests of advisees, information about advisee academic progress during the semester, awareness of academic or personal problems that affected advisee performance, and feedback on referrals were rated as "poor" or "very poor" by over half of the ten advisers. Items rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of returning students or ten percent of academic advisers are listed in Table 1.

Five items were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of advisers on the spring, posttest evaluation. All five of these items were also rated "poor" or "very

Table 1

Pretest Evaluation Items Rated "Poor" or "Very Poor" by over Ten Percent of Returning Students or Academic Advisers

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Percentage Rating Area "Poor" or "Very Poor"[1]
Returning Students[2]	
My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns. (Q-8)	12.1
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	15.5
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	13.8
Academic Advisers[3]	
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	30.0
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	90.0
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	80.0
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	40.0
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	70.0
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	30.0
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	40.0
I was well infomed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	60.0
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	20.0

(Continued)

Table 1 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Percentage Rating Area "Poor" or "Very Poor"[1]
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	40.0
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	20.0
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	30.0
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	20.0
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	30.0
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	50.0
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	50.0

[1] Evaluations based on the 1988-89 academic year.
[2] All returning student who completed an advising evaluation questionnaire: n=58.
[3] All academic advisers: n=10.

poor" by over ten percent of advisers on the pretest evaluation; however, the percentage of advisers rating these areas as inadequate declined from the pretest to the posttest. The items are listed in Table 2. No evaluation areas were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of students on the posttest evaluation.

Six of the fifty-eight returning students who completed a usable questionnaire at the fall 1989 registration either withdrew from school before the second semester or failed to complete a questionnaire in the spring. Three of the fifty-five returning students who did complete a usable survey at

Table 2

Posttest Evaluation Items Rated "Poor" or "Very Poor" by over Ten Percent of Academic Advisers[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Percentage Rating Area "Poor" or "Very Poor"[2]
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	20.0
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	40.0
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	20.0
I was well infomed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	20.0
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	30.0

[1] All academic advisers: n=10. No posttest evaluation items were rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of returning students.

[2] Evaluations based on the 1989-90 academic year.

the March assembly did not complete one at the fall 1989 registration. As a result, the pretest-posttest sample consisted of fifty-two returning students who completed questionnaires at both fall registration and the spring assembly. This sample was used for all remaining pretest-posttest statistics and comparisons. The pretest-posttest student sample represented 71.2 percent of fall students and 86.7 percent of spring students who were enrolled at PBTS during both the 1988-89 and 1989-90 academic years. The pretest-posttest sample of ten advisers represented one hundred percent of PBTS academic advisers in the 1988-89 and 1989-90 academic years.

Pretest and posttest median, mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution were calculated for each item on the student and adviser questionnaires. Pretest-posttest increases in mean satisfaction were recorded for each of the twenty-five items on the student questionnaire, with the largest increase being .71 on the six-point evaluation scale. Increases in median satisfaction were found for fourteen of the twenty-five items on the student evaluation, with twelve of these being a one-point increase. There were no decreases in mean or median satisfaction among returning students in the pretest-posttest evaluation. The twelve evaluation items on which median or mean returning student satisfaction increased by one point or more are listed in Table 3. Complete pretest-posttest differences in median, mean, and standard deviation for returning student evaluations are given in Appendix D. Pretest-posttest frequency distributions for each item are found in Appendix F.

Pretest-posttest increases in mean satisfaction were found for all but one item on the adviser evaluations. Satisfaction with advisees following through on recommendations was the only area with a mean or median decrease in adviser satisfaction. Median increases were found for twenty-three of the adviser questionnaire items. Nineteen of these increases were for one point or more.

Table 3

Questionnaire Items with a Pretest-Posttest Median or Mean Difference of One Scale Point or More for Returning Students[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest Median	Pretest Mean	Posttest Median	Posttest Mean	Difference[a] Median	Difference[a] Mean
My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand. (Q-2)	4	3.98	5	4.39	+1	+.41
My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take. (Q-3)	4	4.18	5	4.62	+1	+.44
My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program. (Q-5)	4	4.27	5	4.58	+1	+.31
My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals. (Q-6)	4	4.30	5	4.39	+1	+.09
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	3	3.49	4	3.83	+1	+.34
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	4	4.00	5	4.62	+1	+.08
My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits. (Q-18)	3	3.53	4	4.21	+1	+.62
My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person. (Q-20)	4	4.25	5	4.96	+1	+.71
My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly. (Q-21)	4	4.17	5	4.77	+1	+.60
My adviser tried to make our advising meetings pleasant. (Q-23)	4	4.42	5	4.88	+1	+.46
My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life. (Q-24)	4	4.18	5	4.62	+1	+.44
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	4	4.29	5	4.60	+1	+.31

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=52. Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

[a] Positive numbers indicate an increase in satisfaction from pretest to posttest.

Adviser evaluation items with differences in median or mean satisfaction of one point or more are listed in Table 4. Complete pretest-posttest differences in median, mean, and standard deviation for adviser evaluations are given in Appendix E. Pretest-posttest frequency distributions for each item are found in Appendix G.

Pretest-posttest differences in satisfaction were compared for individual advisers and returning students for each of the questionnaire statements. There were increases, decreases, and no change in satisfaction found for returning students for each of the twenty-five areas on the advising questionnaire. Over half of returning student in the pretest-posttest sample had increased satisfaction in the area of adviser availability. Half of the students experienced increased satisfaction over their adviser's genuine concern about their professional and personal welfare and growth. More students had decreased satisfaction over their adviser's referrals for additional help than those who had increased satisfaction in this area. More students had no change in satisfaction than those who had either increased or decreased satisfaction for twelve of the twenty-five areas examined. The number of students with increases, decreases, and no change in satisfaction for each questionnaire item are reported in Table 5.

Changes in satisfaction were more dramatic for the ten academic advisers. Increased satisfaction was recorded for over half of the advisers on fifteen of the twenty-five

Table 4

Questionnaire Items with a Pretest-Posttest Median or Mean Difference of One Scale Point or More for Academic Advisers[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest Median	Pretest Mean	Posttest Median	Posttest Mean	Difference[a] Median	Difference[a] Mean
I was well informed about who my advisees were. (Q-1)	4	4.30	5.5	5.30	+1.5	+1.00
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	4	3.90	5.5	5.30	+1.5	+1.40
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	2	2.00	5	4.30	+3	+2.30
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	2	2.00	5	4.50	+3	+2.50
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	3	2.90	4.5	4.20	+1.5	+1.30
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	2	2.10	3.5	3.20	+1.5	+1.10
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	3	2.50	4	4.60	+1	+2.10
I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	2	2.00	3.5	3.60	+1.5	+1.60
I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements. (Q-10)	4	4.30	5	4.80	+1	+.50
I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school. (Q-13)	4	4.00	5	4.60	+1	+.60

(Continued)

Table 4 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest		Posttest		Difference[2]	
	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	3	3.50	4	3.90	+1	+.40
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	3	2.60	4	4.00	+1	+1.40
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	3	3.30	4	4.10	+1	+.80
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	3	2.70	3	3.70	0	+1.00
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	3	2.90	4.5	4.30	+1.5	+1.40
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	3	2.80	5	4.50	+2	+1.70
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	2.5	2.00	3	3.90	+.5	+1.90
My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made. (Q-22)	4	3.70	3	3.30	-1	-.40
The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year. (Q-24)	3	3.33	4	4.00	+1	+.67
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	3	3.10	4	3.70	+1	+.60

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=10. Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

[2] Positive numbers indicate an increase in satisfaction from pretest to posttest.

Table 5

Distribution of Returning Students with an Increase, Decrease, or No Change in Satisfaction

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Satisfaction		No Change	N/A[1]
	Increase	Decrease		
My adviser helped me understand college policies and procedures. (Q-1)	17	7	21	7
My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand. (Q-2)	19	5	18	10
My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take. (Q-3)	21	7	23	1
My adviser helped me understand the requirements of my program. (Q-4)	22	8	21	1
My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program. (Q-5)	18	11	21	2
My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals. (Q-6)	15	12	20	5
My adviser kept track of my academic progress throughout the semester. (Q-7)	19	8	19	6
My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns. (Q-8)	19	6	21	6
My adviser helped me find answers to my questions. (Q-9)	15	9	25	3
My adviser helped me clarify my educational goals. (Q-10)	19	10	17	6
My adviser helped me improve my decision-making skills. (Q-11)	13	8	21	10
My adviser helped me choose an appropriate student ministry or internship. (Q-12)	13	9	13	17
My adviser made me aware of academic and career options available to me. (Q-13)	13	12	18	9

(Continued)

Table 5 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Satisfaction Increase	Satisfaction Decrease	No Change	N/A[1]
My adviser helped me deal with academic problems. (Q-14)	11	2	21	18
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	16	6	17	13
My adviser referred me to the right people and programs to get additional help. (Q-16)	11	18	11	12
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	28	9	14	1
My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits. (Q-18)	18	6	12	16
My adviser extended friendship to me in addition to academic advice. (Q-19)	24	8	20	0
My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person. (Q-20)	26	3	22	1
My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly. (Q-21)	21	4	21	6
My adviser helped me build self-confidence and independence. (Q-22)	15	6	23	8
My adviser tried to make your advising meetings pleasant. (Q-23)	19	3	28	2
My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life. (Q-24)	22	9	18	3
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	20	8	24	0

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=52. N/A - not applicable or no response given on the pretest or posttest or both.

items on the advising questionnaire, including overall satisfaction with advising. No decreases in satisfaction were found in nine areas. Only increases in satisfaction (no decreases and none reporting no change) were indicated by advisers in three areas: information about prior abilities and interests of advisees, tracking of high-risk and academic probation advisees, and knowledge about the results of referrals for advisees.

Not all changes in adviser satisfaction were positive. There was decreased adviser satisfaction in the area of advisees following through with recommendations. The number of advisers who experienced increased satisfaction was only one more than that of those who experienced decreased satisfaction for information about the availability of courses in upcoming semesters, ability to chart out program requirements from entry to graduation, and the personal, spiritual, and academic growth of advisees. The number of advisers with increases, decreases, and no change in satisfaction for each questionnaire item are given in Table 6.

The dependent t-test was used to assess the significance of difference between pretest and posttest satisfaction for each item on the student and adviser questionnaires. Significant improvements in satisfaction at the .05 level were found for seventeen of the twenty-five areas evaluated by returning students, including overall satisfaction with academic advising. Evaluations areas that had significant pretest-posttest differences in student satisfaction at the .05 level are given in Table 7. The differences were significant at the .01 level for eleven

Table 6

Distribution of Academic Advisers with an Increase, Decrease, or No Change in Satisfaction

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Satisfaction Increase	Satisfaction Decrease	No Change	N/A[a]
I was well informed about who my advisees were. (Q-1)	5	2	3	0
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	7	1	2	0
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	9	0	0	1
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	9	0	1	0
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	6	1	3	0
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	6	0	4	0
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	9	0	0	1
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	6	1	3	0
I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	6	0	0	4
I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements. (Q-10)	5	2	3	0
I was well informed about academic programs and requirements in other departments. (Q-11)	5	1	3	1
I was well informed about course options for my advisees. (Q-12)	4	0	5	1
I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school. (Q-13)	4	3	3	0

(Continued)

Table 6 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Satisfaction		No	N/A[1]
	Increase	Decrease	Change	
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	4	3	2	1
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	6	1	3	0
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	6	2	2	0
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	6	0	4	0
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	7	1	2	0
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	9	0	1	0
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	8	1	0	1
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	5	1	4	0
My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made. (Q-22)	2	6	2	0
My advisees grew personally, spiritually, and academically over the course of the year. (Q-23)	2	1	6	1
The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year. (Q-24)	4	0	4	2
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	6	1	3	0

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=10. N/A - not applicable or no response given on the pretest or posttest or both.

evaluation items. Significant improvement in student satisfaction at the .001 level was found in three areas. These were adviser showing genuine concern for the advisee's

Table 7

Advising Areas with a Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Returning Students[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n^2
My adviser helped me understand college policies and procedures. (Q-1)	2.63	.02	45
My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand. (Q-2)	3.34	.01	42
My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take. (Q-3)	2.72	.01	51
My adviser helped me understand the requirements of my program. (Q-4)	2.48	.02	51
My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program. (Q-5)	2.12	.05	50
My adviser kept track of my academic progress throughout the semester. (Q-7)	2.09	.05	46
My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns. (Q-8)	2.92	.01	46
My adviser helped me deal with academic problems. (Q-14)	2.80	.01	34
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	2.71	.01	39
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	3.13	.01	51
My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits. (Q-18)	2.48	.02	36
My adviser extended friendship to me in addition to academic advice. (Q-19)	3.40	.01	52
My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person. (Q-20)	5.22	.001	51

(Continued)

Table 7 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n[a]
My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly. (Q-21)	3.73	.001	46
My adviser tried to make our advising meetings pleasant. (Q-23)	3.83	.001	50
My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life. (Q-24)	3.02	.01	49
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	2.47	.02	52

[1] Significance tested at the .05 level.

[a] Total pretest-posttest sample: n=52. Responses by students who left the item blank or responded "not applicable" on the pretest or posttest or both were deducted from the analysis for that item and the sample size was adjusted accordingly.

professional and personal welfare and growth, adviser really listening to the advisee's problems and responding to them honestly, and adviser trying to make advising sessions pleasant. Areas of student satisfaction that were not significant at the .05 level are reported in Table 8.

Improvements in adviser satisfaction were significant at the .05 level for fifteen of the twenty-five areas evaluated. Seven of these were significant at the .01 level, with four significant at the .001 level. Information about prior abilities and interests of advisees, knowledge about advisee academic progress during the semester, tracking of high-risk and academic probation advisees, and satisfaction with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration were all found to have significant increases in adviser satisfaction at the .001 level of significance.

Table 8

Advising Areas with No Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Returning Students[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n[a]
My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals. (Q-6)	.52	.80	47
My adviser helped me find answers to my questions. (Q-9)	1.60	.20	49
My adviser helped me clarify my educational goals. (Q-10)	1.95	.10	46
My adviser helped me improve my decision-making skills. (Q-11)	1.00	.40	42
My adviser helped me choose an appropriate student ministry or internship. (Q-12)	1.36	.20	35
My adviser made me aware of academic and career options available to me. (Q-13)	.63	.60	43
My adviser referred me to the right people and programs to get additional help. (Q-16)	.92	.40	40
My adviser helped me build self-confidence and independence. (Q-22)	1.92	.10	44

[1] Significance tested at the .05 level.

[a] Total pretest-posttest sample: n=52. Responses by students who left the item blank or responded "not applicable" on the pretest or posttest or both were deducted from the analysis for that item and the sample size was adjusted accordingly.

Evaluation areas that had significant pretest-posttest differences in adviser satisfaction at the .05 level are reported in Table 9.

Adviser satisfaction with advisees following through with recommendations was the only area on either adviser or student evaluations that had a general decline in

Table 9

Advising Areas with a Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Academic Advisers

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n[a]
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	2.94	.02	10
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	5.72	.001	9
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	5.84	.001	10
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	2.18	.05	10
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	3.16	.02	10
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	8.10	.001	9
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	2.45	.05	10
I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	4.54	.01	6
I was well informed about course options for my advisees. (Q-12)	2.31	.05	9
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	2.69	.05	10
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	3.35	.01	10
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	2.69	.05	10
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	5.66	.001	10

(Continued)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n[2]
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	3.69	.01	9
The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year. (Q-24)	2.38	.05	8

---

[1] Significance tested at the .05 level.

[2] Total pretest-posttest sample: n=10. Responses by advisers who left the item blank or responded "not applicable" on the pretest or posttest or both were deducted from the analysis for that item and the sample size was adjusted accordingly.

satisfaction. This decline was found to be significant at the .40 level of significance. Areas in which the pretest-posttest differences in adviser satisfaction were not significant at the .05 level are found in Table 10.

Fifty-five returning students and fifty-seven new students completed the advising preferences survey at the required assembly on March 29, 1990. The student advising preferences sample consisted of 86.2 percent of all day college students at PBTS in the spring 1990 semester (112 students), with 91.7 percent of returning students and 81.4 percent of new students represented. All ten of the academic advisers also completed the advising preferences survey.

Frequency distribution, median, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for four different group categories. academic advisers, all students, returning

Table 10

Advising Areas with No Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Responses of Academic Advisers[1]

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Calculated t value	Level of Significance	n[2]
I was well informed about who my advisees were. (Q-1)	2.02	.10	10
I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements. (Q-10)	1.46	.20	10
I was well informed about academic programs and requirements in other departments. (Q-11)	1.94	.10	9
I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school. (Q-13)	1.11	.40	10
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	.54	.80	9
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	1.71	.10	10
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	1.91	.10	10
My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made. (Q-22)	-1.08[3]	.40	10
My advisees grew personally, spiritually, and academically over the course of the year. (Q-23)	.56	.60	9
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	2.25	.10	10

---

[1] Significance tested at the .05 level.

[2] Total pretest-posttest sample: n=10. Responses by advisers who left the item blank or responded "not applicable" on the pretest or posttest or both were deducted from the analysis for that item and the sample size was adjusted accordingly.

[3] The negative number indicates a decline in satisfaction for this evaluation item.

students, and new students. Complete statistics for median, mean, and standard deviation for each item on the advising preferences survey are found in Appendix H. The frequency distributions for each of the four analysis groups are included in Appendix I.

Over half of the students preferred the new procedures and materials introduced during the trial implementation period in all but one of the areas surveyed; half of the students had no preference over what method advisers used to evaluate advising. For ten items, over seventy-five percent of all students preferred the new procedures and materials. Over ten percent of students preferred the former procedures and materials in four areas. These were procedures relating to student ministry selection (17%), pre-registration activities by group or individual appointment (26%), the number of times advisers meet with all advisees during the semester (15%), and whether drop/add and withdrawal forms are acquired through the academic office or the student's adviser (18%). Table 11 includes the percentage of advisers, all students, returning students, new students preferring the old procedures and materials, and the percentage preferring the new procedures and materials.

Adviser preferences were more varied than the preferences of students. Over half of academic advisers preferred the new methods in seventeen of the twenty-six areas surveyed. Ninety percent of advisers preferred receiving an individual profile on each of their new students, receiving a summary profile of all new students, meeting with high-risk advisees at least four times during the semester, working out a written strategy or advising

Table 11

Percentage Distribution of Advisers and Students Preferring Old and New Advising Methods

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Analysis	Percentage Preferring[2]		
"A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Group[1]	A	B	No Pref.
No adviser training, but registration procedures are reviewed.	Advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures. (Q-1)	Advisers	10.0	70.0	20.0
		All Students	5.4	67.0	27.7
		Returning	7.3	72.7	20.0
		New	3.5	61.4	35.1
None.	Advisers receive an individual profile of academic, personal, and demographic data on each of their new advisees. (Q-2)	Advisers	0	90.0	10.0
		All Students	4.5	80.4	15.2
		Returning	3.6	85.5	10.9
		New	5.3	75.4	19.3
None.	Advisers receive a summary profile of new students. (Q-3)	Advisers	0	90.0	10.0
		All Students	2.7	74.1	23.2
		Returning	1.8	78.2	20.0
		New	3.5	70.2	26.3
Students are assigned to advisers two weeks after fall registration. New students meet with the first available adviser at registration.	Students are assigned to advisers at fall registration. Students meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year. (Q-4)	Advisers	20.0	70.0	10.0
		All Students	8.0	76.8	15.2
		Returning	5.5	74.5	20.0
		New	10.5	78.9	10.5
Advisers are incorporated directly into the registration line.	Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices set off with wall dividers. (Q-5)	Advisers	0	80.0	20.0
		All Students	9.8	70.5	19.6
		Returning	12.7	65.5	21.8
		New	7.0	75.4	17.5

(Continued)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Percentage Preferring[a] A	B	No Pref.
None.	Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester (first meeting in the first three weeks of the semester). (Q-6)	Advisers	0	90.0	10.0
		All Students	1.8	78.6	19.6
		Returning	0	83.6	16.4
		New	3.5	73.7	22.8
None.	Advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for study time, tutorial assistance, meetings with the adviser, and periodic review or tests, quizzes, etc., at the beginning of the semester. (Q-7)	Advisers	0	90.0	10.0
		All Students	2.7	78.6	18.8
		Returning	1.8	85.5	12.7
		New	3.5	71.9	24.6
Students are responsible for securing a student ministry on their own.	Advisers discuss student ministry selection with advisees and make recommendations to the director of student ministries. (Q-8)	Advisers	20.0	50.0	30.0
		All Students	17.0	65.2	17.9
		Returning	21.8	61.8	16.4
		New	12.3	68.4	19.3
None.	Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career or ministry problems. (Q-9)	Advisers	10.0	70.0	20.0
		All Students	1.8	80.4	17.9
		Returning	1.8	80.0	18.2
		New	1.8	80.7	17.5
Advisers receive final grades for their high-risk advisees.	Advisers receive mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request more frequent estimated grade reports. (Q-10)	Advisers	0	90.0	10.0
		All Students	5.4	71.4	23.2
		Returning	7.3	70.9	21.8
		New	3.5	71.9	24.6

(Continued)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Analysis	Percentage Preferring[2]		
"A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Group[1]	A	B	No Pref.
None.	Advising materials are placed in the library for student use (list of available student ministries, course requirements, weekly schedule planners, program planning sheets, estimated grade report sheets, list of advisers' office hours). (Q-11)	Advisers	0	80.0	20.0
		All Students	1.8	83.9	14.3
		Returning	1.8	81.8	16.4
		New	1.8	86.0	12.3
Pre-registration is done only by individual appointment with the adviser.	Pre-registration begins with a group registration/advising assembly, followed by individual appointments for those needing additional help. (Q-12)	Advisers	20.0	60.0	20.0
		All Students	25.9	61.6	12.5
		Returning	32.7	58.2	9.1
		New	19.3	64.9	15.8
The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to advisers at pre-registration time.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time. (Q-13)	Advisers	0	70.0	30.0
		All Students	2.7	84.8	12.5
		Returning	3.6	83.6	12.7
		New	1.8	86.0	12.3
At the adviser's option, office hours are posted on the adviser's office door.	Office hours for all advisers are posted in the academic affairs office, faculty offices area, student center, and library. (Q-14)	Advisers	10.0	50.0	40.0
		All Students	8.0	75.0	17.0
		Returning	10.9	67.3	21.8
		New	5.3	82.5	12.3
None.	Advisers meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester. (Q-15)	Advisers	30.0	30.0	40.0
		All Students	7.1	64.3	28.6
		Returning	7.3	63.6	29.1
		New	7.0	64.9	28.1

(Continued)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Analysis	Percentage Preferring[2]		
"A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Group[1]	A	B	No Pref.
Adviser's meet with all advisees at least once each semester.	Adviser's meet with all advisees at least twice each semester. (Q-16)	Advisers	20.0	50.0	30.0
		All Students	15.2	60.7	24.1
		Returning	18.2	58.2	23.6
		New	12.3	63.2	24.6
The vice-president for academic affairs notifies students of changes in their academic probation status.	Advisers notify advisees of changes in academic probation status and meet with those in need of academic improvement. (Q-17)	Advisers	60.0	40.0	0
		All Students	6.3	74.1	19.6
		Returning	7.3	74.5	18.2
		New	5.3	73.7	21.1
Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from the academic office. Adviser's approval is not required.	Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from their academic adviser, and must discuss course changes with their adviser. (Q-18)	Advisers	20.0	70.0	10.0
		All Students	17.9	67.0	15.2
		Returning	20.0	65.5	14.5
		New	15.8	68.4	15.8
Students get academic petition forms from the academic office.	Students get academic petition forms from their adviser. (Q-19)	Advisers	80.0	20.0	0
		All Students	8.9	54.5	36.6
		Returning	9.1	52.7	38.2
		New	8.8	56.1	35.1
None.	Weekly schedule planners. (Q-20)	Advisers	0	40.0	60.0
		All Students	4.5	73.2	22.3
		Returning	5.5	70.9	23.6
		New	3.5	75.4	21.1
None.	Course requirement sheets outlining each course. (Q-21)	Advisers	10.0	70.0	20.0
		All Students	2.7	85.7	11.6
		Returning	3.6	83.6	12.7
		New	1.8	87.7	10.5

(Continued)

Table 11 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Percentage Preferring[a] A	B	No Pref.
None.	Long-range program planning worksheets. (Q-22)	Advisers	0	70.0	30.0
		All Students	1.8	77.7	20.5
		Returning	1.8	81.8	16.4
		New	1.8	73.7	24.6
None.	Estimated grade and attendance report sheets. (Q-23)	Advisers	0	70.0	30.0
		All Students	5.4	77.7	17.0
		Returning	5.5	81.8	12.7
		New	5.3	73.7	21.1
None.	Advising contract forms. (Q-24)	Advisers	10.0	50.0	40.0
		All Students	7.1	52.7	40.2
		Returning	7.3	60.0	32.7
		New	7.0	45.6	47.4
Adviser self-evaluation checklist.	Adviser evaluation of advising forms. (Q-25)	Advisers	50.0	20.0	30.0
		All Students	9.8	40.2	50.0
		Returning	10.9	38.2	50.9
		New	8.8	42.1	49.1
None.	Student evaluation of advising forms. (Q-26)	Advisers	0	60.0	40.0
		All Students	2.7	69.6	27.7
		Returning	1.8	78.2	20.0
		New	3.5	61.4	35.1

---

[1] Sample sizes: adviser n=10, all students n=112, returning students n=55, new students n=57.

[a] Percentages rounded to one decimal place. Totals may not equal 100.

contract with high-risk advisees at the beginning of the semester, and receiving mid-term and final grades for high-risk advisees.

Over half of advisers preferred the former procedures in two areas. Sixty percent of advisers preferred that the vice-president rather than the adviser notify students of changes in their academic probation status, and eighty percent of advisers preferred that students get academic petition forms from the academic office rather than from the adviser. Thirty percent of advisers liked meeting with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center, and thirty percent did not. Old procedures were preferred by no more than twenty percent of advisers in the remaining twenty-three areas on the survey, with no advisers preferring the former procedures and materials in twelve of these areas.

Mean ratings by all students favored the new procedures, with values ranging from 3.4 to 4.3 on the five-point scale (3 = "no preference"). The median preference by all students for twenty of the twenty-six procedures and materials was four ("mildly prefer 'B'" or new procedures) on the evaluation scale. The median preference for five items was five ("strongly prefer 'B'" or new procedures). Students had a median value of three or "no preference" in only one procedural change: whether advisers used a self-evaluation checklist or completed evaluation of advising forms.

Mean values for advisers on the preferences survey ranging from 2.4 to 4.6 on the five-point survey scale. A median of four was recorded for advisers in seven of the twenty-six items on the survey, and a median of 4.5 or five was found in ten areas. The median value of 1.5 was found for two items, indicating that advisers preferred that the vice-president for academic affairs notify students of changes in their academic probation status and that students get academic petition forms from the academic office. In the implementation period, advisers notified advisees of changes in academic probation status, and students got academic petition forms from their academic advisers.

Mean values of 4.0 or higher or 2.0 or lower were arbitrarily selected as parameters for identifying significant preferences in each of the four analysis groups. Survey items with mean values within these parameters for advisers, all students, returning students, or new students are given in Table 12. Participants in one or more of the four analysis groups preferred new procedures or materials in nineteen of the twenty-six areas surveyed. A significant preference for the status quo was preferred in only one of the survey areas, and by only one of the four analysis groups. Advisers had a mean value of 2.0, preferring that students get academic petition forms from the academic office rather than from their academic adviser.

Differences in significance between advisers and students were found in six of the areas on the advising

Table 12

Methods Preferred by Advisers, All Students, Returning Students, or New Students[1]

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Mean Values[a] Academic Advisers	--- Students --- All	 Returning	 New
No adviser training, but registration procedures are reviewed.	Advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures. (Q-1)	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9
None.	Advisers receive a profile of academic, personal, and demographic data on their new advisees. (Q-2)	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.1
None.	Advisers receive a summary profile of new students. (Q-3)	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.1
Students are assigned to advisers two weeks after fall registration. New students meet with the first available adviser at registration.	Students are assigned to advisers at fall registration. Students meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year. (Q-4)	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Advisers are incorporated directly into the registration line.	Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices set off with wall dividers. (Q-5)	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1
None.	Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester (first meeting in the first three weeks of the semester). (Q-6)	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2

(Continued)

Table 12 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Mean Values^a			
"A"	"B"	Academic	--- Students ---		
(Old System)	(New System)	Advisers	All	Returning	New
None.	Advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for study time, tutorial assistance, meetings with the adviser, and periodic review or tests, quizzes, etc., at the beginning of the semester. (Q-7)	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.1
None.	Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career or ministry problems. (Q-9)	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.2
Advisers receive final grades for their high-risk advisees.	Advisers receive mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request more frequent estimated grade reports. (Q-10)	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.0
None.	Advising materials are placed in the library for student use (list of available student ministries, course requirements, weekly schedule planners, program planning sheets, estimated grade report sheets, list of advisers' office hours). (Q-11)	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to advisers at pre-registration time.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time. (Q-13)	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3

(Continued)

Table 12 (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Mean Values[2]			
		Academic	--- Students ---		
"A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Advisers	All	Returning	New
At the adviser's option, office hours are posted on the adviser's office door.	Office hours for all advisers are posted in the academic affairs office, faculty offices area, student center, and library. (Q-14)	3.6	4.1	3.9	4.2
None.	Advisers meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester. (Q-15)	2.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
The vice-president for academic affairs notifies students of changes in their academic probation status.	Advisers notify advisees of changes in academic probation status and meet with those in need of academic improvement. (Q-17)	2.4	4.1	4.0	4.1
Students get academic petition forms from the academic office.	Students get academic petition forms from their adviser. (Q-19)	2.0	3.6	3.6	3.6
None.	Weekly schedule planners. (Q-20)	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.1
None.	Course requirement sheets outlining each course. (Q-21)	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.4
None.	Long-range program planning worksheets. (Q-22)	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2
None.	Estimated grade and attendance report sheets. (Q-23)	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.1
None.	Student evaluation of advising forms. (Q-26)	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.8

---

[1] Sample sizes: advisers n=10, all students n=112, returning students n=55, new students n=57.

[2] Means of 2.0 smaller indicate significant preference for old procedures (A). Means of 4.0 or greater indicate significant preference for new procedures (B). Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

preferences survey. Advisers highly preferred that students get academic petition forms from the academic office rather than from the adviser, and that advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures. Although not at a significant level, students preferred pre- and in-service training for advisers, and preferred to get academic petition forms from their adviser rather than the academic office. Students strongly preferred that office hours for all advisers be posted in various locations around campus, and that weekly schedule planners and estimated grade and attendance report sheets be used. Advisers preferred these procedures, but not at a significant level.

Differences in significance were also found between returning students and new students. A significant number of returning students preferred that advisers receive training in advising techniques and materials. New students also preferred training for advisers, but at a level that was not significant. The posting of adviser office hours in various locations around campus and advisers meeting with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester were preferred by a significant number of new students. Returning students preferred these procedures, but not at a significant level.

Significant preferences for new procedures and materials were recorded for all four analysis groups for eleven items. All groups preferred that advisers receive an individual profile on each of their new advisees, that advisers receive a summary profile of new students, that students be assigned to advisers at fall registration and meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year, that advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester, that advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for assistance at the beginning of the semester, and that advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career problems. All four groups also preferred by a significant margin that advising materials be placed in the library for student use, that the regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses be distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time, that the use of course requirement sheets outlining each course be continued, and that the use of long-range planning worksheets be continued.

Chapter 5

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Interpretation of Results

Pretest-Posttest Evaluation

The number of areas of academic advising rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of academic advisers or over ten percent of returning students substantially decreased from pretest to posttest. Although only three areas were found to be inadequate by students on the pretest, all areas were rated acceptable by over ninety percent of returning students on the posttest. While sixteen areas were found inadequate by over ten percent of advisers on the pretest, this number dropped to five on the posttest--a sixty-nine percent reduction in the number of advising areas considered unacceptable. The most notable declines were recorded for information about advisee academic progress during the semester and knowledge of prior abilities and interests of advisees. The percentage of advisers rating these areas as inadequate dropped from eighty and ninety percent on the pretest to ten percent on the posttest. Despite these improvements in satisfaction, twenty to forty percent of advisers rated their knowledge of advisee plans to drop a course or withdraw from school, awareness of academic or personal problems that affected performance, information about institutional support services, feedback on referrals, and amount of time advisees met with them to be "poor" or "very poor" during the model implementation period.

Increases in mean and median satisfaction were found for both returning students and advisers in the study. Mean increase in returning student satisfaction were found for each of the twenty-five evaluation areas considered. No mean or median decreases in returning student satisfaction were found for any of the items on the questionnaire. Mean or median increases of one point or more on the six-point evaluation scale were found for twelve of the items on the student evaluation. Adviser showing genuine concern for the student, listening to problems and responding honestly, and suggesting ways to improve academic skills and study habits were the areas with the greatest mean increase in returning student satisfaction.

Mean results of the adviser satisfaction analysis were similar, with mean increases for twenty-four of the twenty-five items. Only satisfaction with advisees following through on recommendations did not have a mean increase from pretest to posttest. Although the number of areas in which increases were found was similar for advisers and students, the magnitude of increases in satisfaction was greater for advisers than for students. Mean or median increases of one point or more on the six-point evaluation scale were found for twenty of the twenty-five evaluation areas. Mean or median increases of two or more points were found in four areas: information about prior abilities and interests of advisees, knowledge of academic progress during the semester, tracking of high-risk and academic probation advisees, and satisfaction with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration.

Comparisons of pretest-posttest responses of individual students also favored the new system model. On twenty-four questionnaire items, the number of returning students who gave higher ratings on the posttest than they did on the pretest was greater than that of students who gave lower ratings. The number of students with increased satisfaction outpaced that of those with decreased satisfaction by a three-to-one margin or greater for over half of the items on the questionnaire. During the implementation period, satisfaction increased for over forty percent of returning students in the areas of adviser knowledge of program requirements and tracking of what courses the student needed to take, assistance in understanding the requirements of the student's program, availability, friendship and genuine concern for the student's welfare and growth, interest and honest response to the student's problems, and encouragement to the student. Adviser referring the student to the right person to get help was the sole questionnaire item for which the number of students whose satisfaction decreased outpaced that of those whose satisfaction increased.

Changes in the satisfaction of individual advisers were more varied than that of students. Dramatic increases in satisfaction were found for information about prior abilities and interests of advisees, knowledge about academic progress during the semester, tracking of high-risk advisees, and advising aspects of registration and pre-registration, with ninety percent of advisers experiencing increased satisfaction with the new system model over the status quo, and no advisers experiencing decreased satisfaction in these areas. In contrast, three times as many advisers experienced decreased satisfaction as those that experienced increased satisfaction for advisees following through on recommendations.

At least half of advisers had higher posttest levels of satisfaction on nineteen of the twenty-five evaluation items. Information about course options and the availability of courses in upcoming semesters, the ability to chart out an advisee's program from entry to graduation, advisees following through on recommendations, satisfaction with the academic growth of high-risk advisees, and satisfaction with the personal, spiritual, and academic growth of advisees were the only areas in which less than half of advisers experienced increased satisfaction from pretest to posttest.

Although the number of students and advisers who gave higher ratings on the posttest than pretest frequently outpaced that of those who gave lower ratings, these results must be examined in light of the number of participants who had no change or did not respond to the particular evaluation item. For thirteen of the items on the questionnaire, over half of returning students had no change in satisfaction or no pretest-posttest response. In seven of these instances, over thirty percent of students still had increases in satisfaction. The number of students experiencing decreased satisfaction exceeded twenty percent of the sample in only four areas: help in selecting the appropriate courses, tailoring course selection to career and life goals, making the student aware of academic and career options, and providing accurate referrals.

Over half of advisers had no change in satisfaction or no pretest-posttest response for three questionnaire items. However, only one adviser had a decrease in satisfaction, and that in only one of these three areas. Consequently, the negative impact of the new advising model in areas affected by a high percentage of advisers with no change in satisfaction was minimal.

There were statistically significant differences between pretest and posttest responses of both advisers and returning students. All significant differences reflected improved satisfaction as a result of the system model. Greater satisfaction under the status quo was found for only one area, but the difference was not significant. Pretest-posttest differences in returning student satisfaction were significant for seventeen of the twenty-five items on the evaluation. Similarly, differences in adviser satisfaction were significant for fifteen items.

Although the .05 level was used as the statistical criterion for significance, differences were found at the .01 level in eleven areas of the student evaluation, with seven of these at the .001 level. Students were far more satisfied with the new advising system in the areas of the adviser clarifying recommendations and procedures, knowing program requirements and tracking what courses were needed, encouraging the student to talk about problems, helping with academic problems, making the student aware of college resources, being available to the student, extending friendship to the student, projecting concern for the student's welfare and growth, listening to problems and responding to them honestly, trying to make advising sessions pleasant, and encouraging the student in his spiritual life.

Significant improvements in adviser satisfaction at the .01 level were found in seven areas, with four of these being significant at the .001 level. This superior satisfaction was found in the areas of information about prior abilities and interests of advisees, knowledge about academic progress during the semester, tracking of high-risk students, feedback on referrals, involvement in the selection of student ministries, satisfaction with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration, and sufficient time, information, and resources to really help advisees.

Overall satisfaction with advising was measured by the last question on each survey. A statistically significant increase in satisfaction was found for returning students, but not for academic advisers. Although not significant at the .05 level, the increase in adviser satisfaction under the new system was significant at the .10 level, and nearly significant at the .05 level.

Advising Preferences Survey

Results of the advising preferences survey supported the continued use of methods implemented in the advising model. Methods utilized in the new system were preferred by at least half of advisers and students for twenty-one of the twenty-six items on the survey. Group social contact between adviser and advisees, advisers notifying advisees of changes in their academic probation status, students getting academic petition forms from their adviser, and the availability of weekly schedule planning sheets were all preferred by over half of students, but not by over half of advisers. In contrast, over half of advisers preferred that the vice-president for academic affairs notify students of changes in their academic probation status and that students get academic petition forms from the academic office. Half of advisers preferred a self-evaluation checklist to adviser evaluation forms, but favored continued use of student evaluation forms.

Most advisers and students expressed preferences on the survey items. Only six survey items had no preference responses by over one-third of advisers or students. Over one-third of students had no preference about whether academic petition forms were available from the academic office or from the adviser, whether or not advising contract forms were used, and whether advisers completed advising evaluation forms or self-evaluation checklists. The lack of student preference over evaluation methods used by advisers is quite appropriate, since this matter pertains more to advisers than to students. Over one-third of advisers had no preference in whether office hours were posted in various locations across the campus or on the adviser's office door, whether or not advisers met with students for coffee or donuts in the student center, whether weekly schedule planners were made available to students and advisers, whether or not advising contract forms were used, and whether or not students completed advising evaluations. It should be noted that while forty percent of advisers had no preference about student evaluations of advising, the remaining sixty percent favored the use of student evaluations.

Mean values on the advising preferences survey also favored the new system. Mean values in all categories of analysis (advisers, all students, returning students, new students) were above the 3.0 or "no preference" level for twenty-three of the twenty-six items on the survey. Advisers mildly preferred the that there be no group social contact with advisees, that the vice-president for academic affairs notify students of changes in their academic probation status, and that students get academic petition forms from the academic office. In contrast, students--returning or new--mildly preferred the new methods in each of these three areas.

Significant mean values for one or more of the analysis groups (advisers, all students, returning students, new students) were found for nineteen of the methods in the advising preferences survey. In eighteen of these instances, the new methods were highly preferred over the old. The only preference for the status quo was that advisers preferred that students get academic petition forms from the academic office rather than from their academic adviser, while students had no significant preference on this matter.

Only minor differences were found between the mean values of returning students and new students. In five instances the mean value of one group was significant while the mean value of the other was not; however, the difference between mean scores was .2 in four of these cases, and .3 in the fifth. In all five instances, the mean value of both groups was higher than 3.0 or "no preference."

The difference between mean values of advisers and students was more varied. The value of one group was significant and the value of the other was not in five areas. In four of these instances, the difference was .5 or less, and all values were greater than 3.0 or "no preference." There was a large difference between the means of advisers and students in the fifth area. While advisers strongly preferred that students get academic petition forms from the academic office, students slightly preferred getting forms from their academic adviser.

Eleven of the new strategies were preferred by a significant margin in all four analysis groups. These areas included the use of individual and summary profiles on new students, advising assignments at registration, intervention techniques for high-risk students and the use of advising contracts, adviser involvement in student ministries, dissemination of complete pre-registration information to both advisers and students, and the use of course requirement sheets and long-range planning worksheets.

Comparison of Findings to Those in the Literature

There were several correlations between the findings of this study and findings discussed in the literature. Ford (1988), Kishler (1986), Noel (1983), Purnell (1983), and Crockett (1982) found good listening skills, adviser availability, thorough knowledge of college policies and procedures, and a caring, genuine interest in advisees to be characteristics of effective advisers. Significant improvements in student satisfaction were found in all of these areas from pretest to posttest evaluations in the PBTS study. Burrell and Trombley (1983) found that only forty-six percent of students felt that their advisers took a personal interest in them. Seventy-three percent of returning students at PBTS rated their advisers "very good" or "excellent" in this area on the posttest, up from forty percent on the pretest.

McMillian and McKinney (1985) found that setting office hours when the adviser would always be available to students was a very important element in the successful academic advising program. There was a twenty percent increase from pretest to posttest in the number of returning students at PBTS who rated adviser availability "very good" or "excellent." Furthermore, Larsen and Brown (1982) found that ninety percent of students felt that advisers should publish their office hours, while only sixty-nine percent of faculty advisers agreed. Seventy-five percent of students responded on the advising preferences survey that they wanted office hours for advisers posted in various locations around campus, compared to fifty percent of advisers who felt this was desirable.

Larsen and Brown (1982) found that there was a large discrepancy between the percentage of advisers who felt that they should be involved in career guidance (72%) and the percentage of students who felt advisers should be involved in these matters (90%). Both faculty and student participants in the study at PBTS were less desirous of adviser involvement in one aspect of career counseling--student ministry selection. Fifty percent of advisers at

PBTS preferred involvement in the selection of a student ministry, compared to sixty-five percent of students who desired adviser involvement student ministry selection.

Hadden (1988), Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987), Kelly and White (1986), Klepper, Nelson, and Miller (1987), Higbee and Dwinell (1988), and Glennen (1983) found that the dissemination of student profile data to academic advisers was an important practice in the effective advising program. Ninety percent of advisers and eighty percent of students at PBTS agreed that academic, personal, and demographic data on new students should be supplied to academic advisers. Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987) found the use of course summaries to be helpful in academic advising. While only seventy percent of advisers felt that the use of course requirement sheets should be continued, eighty-six percent of students at PBTS preferred that this information be available. Crockett (1982) and Lipschutz, Prola, and Stem (1985) found group advising to be highly effective. Only sixty percent of advisers and students at PBTS preferred a combination of group and individual advising for pre-registration to all individual counseling.

Special assistance for high-risk students was frequently discussed in the literature. Noel et al. (1985) and Johnson (1986) found early alert systems to be important in high-risk advising. With the institution of estimated grade reports for high-risk students in the trial model at PBTS, mean adviser satisfaction with their knowledge of advisee academic progress and tracking of high-risk students increased by over two points on the five-point evaluation scale. Bland et al. (1987), Sharkey et al. (1987), Cellucci and Price (1986), Hudesman et al. (1986), Letchworth and Bleidt (1983), Crockett (1983), and Glennen (1983) found intervention to be important in the assisting of high-risk students. Ninety percent of advisers at PBTS and seventy-nine percent of students felt that the practice of advisers meeting with high-risk student at least four times during the semester should be continued. The same percentages of advisers and students felt that a written strategy or advising contract between advisers and high-risk students should be a continued practice at the institution.

Adviser training was also a major issue discussed in the literature. The Task Force on Student Flow Model at Mount Royal College (1987), Lindemann, DeCabooter, and Cordova (1987), Noel et al. (1985), Kishler (1985), Winston et al. (1984), and Crockett (1983) emphasized the need for systematic adviser training. Pre- and in-service training was preferred by seventy percent of advisers, and though to be a worthy component of the advising system by sixty-seven percent of students (20% of advisers and 28% of student had no preference).

Conclusions

The implementation of the academic advising trial model was responsible for a substantial reduction in the number of advising areas rated "poor" or "very poor" by over ten percent of academic advisers or over ten percent of returning students. Areas considered inadequate by over ten percent of students were eliminated, and a sixty-nine percent reduction in unsatisfactory areas was recorded for advisers. Despite the success of the program in this area, continued efforts are needed to reduce unsatisfactory ratings in five areas. These are adviser knowledge of advisee plans to drop a course, adviser awareness of academic or personal problems that affected advisee performance, information about institutional support services, feedback on referrals, and adviser satisfaction with the number of times advisees were willing to meet with them during the semester.

The academic advising model was also responsible for a substantial overall increase in the mean and median levels of satisfaction for both advisers and students. Mean student satisfaction increased in each of the twenty-five areas examined in the study, and mean adviser satisfaction increased in twenty-four of the twenty-five areas examined. Some of these increases were quite large, with increases in mean or median satisfaction of one point or more on the six-point evaluation scale found for twelve student items and twenty adviser items.

The implementation of the advising trial model was responsible for significant improvements in individual satisfaction for both advisers and students. Statistically significant improvements in adviser satisfaction were found in fifteen of the twenty-five areas examined, and statistically significant improvements in returning student satisfaction were found in seventeen of the twenty-five analysis areas. Over forty percent of advisers had increased posttest satisfaction in nineteen evaluation areas, and over forty percent of students had increased satisfaction in eight areas.

The advising trial model was responsible for significant improvements in adviser satisfaction in the following areas:

Timely notification of advising assignments.

Information about prior abilities and interests of advisees.

Information about academic progress during the semester.

Tracking of high-risk advisees.

Growth of the academic skills of high-risk advisees.

Awareness of advisee plans to drop a course or withdraw from school.

Awareness of academic and personal problems that affected advisee performance.

Information about support services and feedback on referrals.

Information about course options.

Sufficient time, information, and resources to help advisees.

Satisfaction with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration.

Participation in the selection of appropriate student ministries.

Documentation of recommendations in advising records.

Satisfaction with the level of institutional support and recognition for advisers.

The advising trial model was responsible for significant improvements in student satisfaction in the following areas:

Adviser assistance in understanding college policies and procedures, and clarification of recommendations, policies, and procedures.

Adviser knowledge and clarification of program requirements, and tracking of what courses the advisee needed.

Adviser help in selecting appropriate courses.

Adviser tracking of advisee academic progress.

Adviser help with academic problems and concerns, and discussion of college support services.

Adviser availability, friendship, and genuine concern about the welfare and growth of the advisee as a professional and as a person.

Adviser attempts to make advising sessions pleasant, and to really listen to the advisees problems and respond honestly.

Adviser's encouragement of the student in spiritual matters.

Advisee's overall experience with advising.

Both students and advisers preferred procedures and materials used in the advising trial model over the former advising system. New methods were preferred by both advisers and students in seventeen of the twenty-six areas surveyed, with significant preferences by either advisers or students or both found for all seventeen areas. The following methods were preferred by advisers and students by a significant margin:

> Advisers receive training in advising procedures.
>
> Advisers receive individual student profiles on their new advisees, and a summary profile of new students.
>
> Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices, and students are assigned to advisers at fall registration.
>
> Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester, and work out an advising contract with high-risk students.
>
> Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations for all their advisees, and mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request additional estimated grade reports.
>
> Advising materials are placed in the library for student use and distributed to academic advisers. These include weekly schedule planners, course requirement summaries, long-range planning worksheets, and estimated grade report sheets.
>
> The regular fulltime course load is distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time.
>
> Adviser office hours are posted in various locations around campus.
>
> Students complete advising evaluation forms annually.

Conflicting preferences were found over whether or not advisers should meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts once each semester, whether the vice-president for academic affairs or the adviser should notify students of changes in academic probation status, and whether students should get academic petition forms from the academic office or from their adviser.

Recommendations for the Improvement of Practice, Including Strategies for Diffusion, Implementation, and Improvement

It is recommended that PBTS implement a permanent advising program based on the trial model executed during the 1989-90 academic year. Since the trial model required no additional funding, and resulted in significant improvements in both student and adviser satisfaction, the new advising program should be implemented as soon as possible. Components of the new system should include adviser training, the collection and dissemination of academic, personal, and demographic data on new students, intrusive advising for high-risk students, and modified registration and pre-registration procedures as implemented in the trial model.

Adviser training should be conducted on a pre-service and in-service basis. It is recommended that a brief review of advising services, procedures, and materials be given at the annual August faculty development seminar. This should be followed up by a presentation on the demographics of the incoming freshman class at the September faculty meeting. A review of pre-registration procedures, curricular changes, and course options should be given shortly before pre-registration begins in both fall and spring semesters. Opportunity for questions and suggestions should be included with each session. Unless new academic advisers are added, each of these presentations may require as little as fifteen to thirty minutes.

Tentative advising assignments should continue to be made prior to fall registration, and finalized assignments confirmed on the day of registration. Furthermore, advisers should be furnished with as much data on their new advisees as possible prior to the beginning of the semester. All profile information should be in the hands of advisers by the start of the fall semester. The placement of advisers in temporary offices adjacent to the registration line should also be continued.

Adviser involvement in the selection of student ministry should be continued. Advisers should continue to discuss student ministry options with their advisees and submit recommendations to the director of student ministries at the beginning of the fall semester. The director of student ministries should continue to forward a copy of the student's ministry evaluation to the adviser and communicate any other input from outside agencies about student internship performance to the adviser, so that the adviser may be knowledgeable in counseling the student about academic and career decisions. Furthermore, advisers should be given additional instruction in the types of student ministry and placement options that are available to their advisees, as well as the professional outlook for various ministry fields.

Intrusive advising for high-risk and academic probation advisees should be continued. Advisers should be encouraged to meet with high-risk advisees at least monthly, establish a written advising contract, and frequently review estimated grades to insure that these students do not academically overextend themselves.

In light of the inconsistency with which students pursue faculty for estimated grades, it is recommended that the academic office take responsibility for acquiring grades for students with poor performance and reporting this information to both the adviser and student. Under the trial model, faculty were required to submit estimated grades at mid-term. It is recommended that estimated grades for students with unsatisfactory performance be reported by the end of each month as an early alert system.

The advising file in the library should be maintained so that students have ready access to weekly schedule planners, course requirements summaries, long-range program planning worksheets, lists of available student ministries, and other materials that may be helpful. Adviser office hours should also be collected and posted in the academic office, faculty offices area, student center, and library, as was done during implementation of the trial model.

Distribution of the regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses should continue to be distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time. The use of group advising sessions should be continued, but additional suggestions on how to use these sessions should be given to advisers.

Informal group meetings with advisees in the student center for coffee and donuts or other types of informal adviser-advisee contact should be supported, but as an adviser's option since some advisers strongly preferred this option while others did not desire this type of contact. Advisers should be encouraged to meet with each of their advisees at least twice each semester, either through formal appointments or casual contacts to insure open dialogue between adviser and advisee.

Academic petition forms and drop/add forms should be supplied to advisers, but made available directly to students through the academic office or other campus offices as the primary source for these forms. This way advisers would not be responsible for distributing the forms, but in the course of discussions with their advisees would have the forms available to give to students. It will be important to make sure that all support staff check each form for an adviser's initials before processing to insure that any plans to drop a course or substitute a course have been reviewed by the academic adviser.

Since advisers were generally opposed to notifying their advisees about changes in academic probation status, it is recommended that the vice-president for academic affairs carry out this responsibility. However, advisers should simultaneously be notified of the change and be encouraged to send a personal note to the student. The adviser could offer praise for accomplishment or suggest the need to meet with the student to discuss strategies for improvement, as the situation warrants.

Both student and adviser evaluation of advising should be done on an annual basis. Student evaluation forms may be completed at one of the group pre-registration sessions in the spring semester. Advisers should complete their evaluations at the same time. After being reviewed by the adviser, both adviser and student evaluation forms should be returned to the academic office shortly after pre-registration in the spring. Further refinements to the advising system should be based on the results of the annual evaluations.

REFERENCES

American College Testing Program. The High School Profile Report: Normative Data. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1986.

Amos, Arthur K., Jr. Advising at UC Davis: A Report of Student Opinions. ERIC ED 294 490, 1988.

Astin, Alexander W., Kenneth C. Green, William S. Korn, Marilynn Schalit, and Ellyne R. Berz. The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1988. ERIC ED 303 133, 1988.

Balunas, Lynn. A Study of the Effects of Student Employment on Grade Point Average and Retention at Broom Community College. ERIC ED 277 446, 1986.

Bland, Vivian, Vivian Boyd, Steven Carstens, Patricia Hunt, Stanley Hunt, Mary Leonard, Thomas Mayoon, and Jean McDevitt. Diagnostic and Prescriptive Interviews with Undecided Freshmen in Academic Jeopardy. ERIC Ed 290 973, 1987.

Blustein, David L., Thomas P. Judd, Judith Krom, Barbara Vinian, Elaine Padilla, Richard Wedemeyer, and Dell Williams. "Identifying Predictors of Academic Performance of Community College Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 27:242-49. May 1986.

Boyd, Vivian, Steven Carstens, Patricia Hunt, Stanley Hunt, Brian McLaren, Thomas Magoon. Diagnostic and Prescriptive Interviews with Transfer Students in Academic Jeopardy. ERIC ED 291 445, 1987.

Brown, Janet V. E., and Russell D. Robinson. "The Adult Male Undergraduate: Who Stays and Who Leaves?" College Student Journal, 22:95-100. Spring 1988.

Buhr, Tania, Greg Pelletier, and David Wark. "An Orientation Program that Increases the Quality of Student-Adviser Contact." Journal of College Student Personnel, 28:462-63. September 1987.

Burrell, Leon F., and Toni B. Trombley. "Academic Advising with Minority Students on Predominantly White Campuses." Journal of College Student Personnel, 24:121-26. March 1983.

Carstensen, Donald J., and Constance Silberhorn. *A National Survey of Academic Advising: Final Report*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1979.

Cellucci, Philomena M. C., and Teresa P. Price. *A Map for Success: IMPACT, a High-Risk Student Retention Plan*. ERIC ED 278 440, 1986.

Chatman, Steven P. "Short-Term Forecasts of the Number and Scholastic Ability of Enrolling Freshmen by Academic Divisions." *Research in Higher Education*, 25:68-81. Number 1, 1986.

Clark, Renee Smith. *Academic Achievement of GED Graduates of the Community College of Allegheny County*. ERIC ED 284 050, 1987.

Creamer, Don G., and Charles A. Atwell. "The Great Debate: Academic Advising." *Community and Junior College Journal*, 54:18-20. May 1984.

Crockett, David. *Academic Advising Audit*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program, 1983.

Crockett, David. "Academic Advising Delivery Systems." In *Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising*. Edited by Roger B. Winston, Jr., Steven C. Enders, and Theodore K. Miller. New Directions for Students Services Series, No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Dodge, Susan. "SAT, ACT Scores Remain Steady or Drop Slightly." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36:A37. September 20, 1989.

Dunphy, Linda, Thomas E. Miller, Tina Woodruff, and John E. Nelson. "Exemplary Retention Strategies for the Freshman Year." In *Increasing Retention: Academic and Student Affairs Administrators in Partnership*. Edited by Marth McGinty Stodt and William M. Klepper. New Directions for Higher Education Series, No. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Ender, Steven C. "The Adviser in a Teaching Role." *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28:374-75. July 1987.

Ender, Steven C., and Roger B. Winston, Jr. "Training Allied Professional Academic Advisers." In *Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising*. Edited by Roger B. Winston, Jr., Steven C. Enders, and Theodore K. Miller. New Directions for Students Services Series, No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Frisz, Ruth H., and Jeffrey R. Lane. "Student User Evaluations of Peer Adviser Services." Journal of College Student Personnel, 28:241-45. May 1987.

Ford, Jerry. Academic Advising Handbook 1988-89: Houston Baptist University. ERIC ED 301 097, 1988.

Harris, Howard L., and Claudia J. Hansson. Assessment Testing: Analysis and Predictions Spring-Fall 1985. ERIC ED 274 386, 1986.

Garnett, Donald T., ed. Developmental Advising--How? Why? Proceedings of the Region VII Conference on Academic Advising, National Academic Advising Association. ERIC ED 298 825, 1988.

Glennen, Robert E. "Effective Outcome Measures of Intrusive Advising Programs." In A New Look at Successful Programs. Edited by John E. Roueche. New Directions for College Learning Assistance Series, No. 11. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Glennen, R. E., D. M. Baxley, and P. J. Farren. "Impact of Intrusive Advising on Minority Student Retention." College Student Journal, 19:335-38. Winter 1985.

Grites, Thomas J. "Advising for Special Populations." In Developmental Approaches to Academic Advising. Edited by Roger B. Winston, Jr., Steven C. Enders, and Theodore K. Miller. New Directions for Students Services Series, No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982a.

Hadden, Craig. The Placement Process at Colorado Mountain College: Placement Testing and the Advising Matrix. ERIC ED 302 298, 1988.

Healy, Charles C., and Don L. Mourton. "The Relationship of Career Exploration, College Jobs, and Grade Point Average." Journal of College Student Personnel, 28:28-34. January 1987.

Heller, Scott. "Delighted Authors Find Their Agenda for Education Is a Huge Hit." Chronicle of Higher Education, 36:A42-43. December 13, 1989.

Higbee, Jeanne L., and Patricia L. Dwinell. Creating Profiles of High Risk Students. ERIC ED 298 181, 1988.

Hudesman, John, Basil Avramides, Charles Loveday, and Anne-Sojourner Wendell. "Locus of Control and Allocation Phase: Impact on the Academic Achievement of Special Program Students over Three Semesters." College Student Journal, 19:23-29. Spring 1985.

Hudesman, John, Basil Avramides, Charles Loveday, Anne-Sojourner Wendell, and Russell Griemsmann. "Impact of Counseling Style on the Academic Performance of College Students in Special Programs." Journal of College Student Personnel, 27:394-99. September 1986.

Johnson, F. Frances. "An Intrusive Advising Program for Freshmen on Academic Probation." Journal of College Student Personnel, 27:362-63, July 1986.

Kalna, James R. "The Entering Student Survey: A High Risk Identification Tool." Journal of College Student Personnel, 27:274-75. May 1986.

Kishler, Thomas C. A University-Wide Newsletter for Academic Advisers: Responding to the Needs for Current, Accurate, and Useful Information. ERIC ED 270 012, 1986.

Kishler, Thomas C. "Coordinating the Communication and Development of Advisers." Journal of College Student Personnnel, 26:473-74. September 1985.

Kelly, James J., and Eric R. White. Profiling Freshman Academic Characteristics. ERIC ED 284 458, 1986.

Kessler, Ronald P. Can Reading Placement Scores Predict Classroom Performance?: A Discriminant Analysis. ERIC ED 291 440, 1987.

Klepper, William M., John E. Nelson, and Thomas E. Miller. "The Role of Institutional Research in Retention." In Increasing Retention: Academic and Student Affairs Administrators in Partnership. Edited by Martha McGinty Stodt and William M. Klepper. New Directions for Higher Education Series, no. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Kroll, Ronald C. "A Comparison of Grades for One Year and Three Year Students Enrolled in the Course Pauline Epistles at Practical Bible Training School." Ed.D. practicum, Nova University, 1989a.

Kroll, Ronald C. Analysis of the Enrollment Impact of Implementing an Academic Entrance Requirement at Practical Bible Training School. ERIC ED 312 949, 1989b.

Kroll, Ronald C. "Development of a Profile of Entering Students at Practical Bible Training School as a Tool for Academic Advising." Ed.D. practicum, Nova University, 1990.

Larsen, Max D., and Bonnie Brown. *Student and Faculty Expectations of Academic Advising*. ERIC ED 216 580, 1982.

Letchworth, George E., and Patricia Bleidt. "Intrusive Counseling with Students Placed on Academic Warning." *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24:456-58. September 1983.

Lindemann, William H., Jr., Arthur W. DeCabooter, and John A. Cordova. *Student Success: The Common Goal*. ERIC ED 292 527, 1987.

Lipschutz, David, Max Prola, and Daniel Stem. "Meeting the Challenge of Economic Necessity: An Academic Advisement Program for Freshmen." *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26:472-73. September 1985.

Lewis, Merrilee, R., Mary Ann Cox, Vern Browne, and Alan Hitt. *Performance of San Joaquin Delta College Freshmen Students in Reading, Writing and Math by Ethnicity, High School Status and Age*. ERIC ED 265 895, 1985.

Lumpkins, Bob, and Hurst Hall. "Advising College Undergraduates--A Neglected Art." *College Student Journal*, 21:98-100. Spring 1987.

Lyons, Arthur W. *Applying Humanistic and Behavioral Principles to Assist High-Risk Freshmen*. ERIC ED 262 692, 1985.

Lyttle, R. Orville. "Have You Ever Had an Advising Week?" *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26:651-62. November 1985.

McMillian, Martha, and Kathleen McKinney. *Strategies for Effective Undergraduate Advising in Sociology*. ERIC ED 273 209, 1985.

Martin, Margaret R., and Janet R. Brown. *Special Services Project: Rockland Community College, 1985-1986*. ERIC ED 273 343, 1986.

Metzner, Barbara S., and John P. Bean. "The Estimation of a Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Undergraduate Student Attrition." *Research in Higher Education*, 27:15-38. Number 1, 1987.

Moore, Carol A., Patrick P. Murphy, and Michael R. Gore. *Advising the Advisors: A Preventitive Intervention Strategy*. ERIC ED 260 614, 1985.

Moore, James W. Understanding, Advising, and Teaching International Students: A Handbook for Faculty. ERIC ED 289 427, 1987.

Moores, Keith, and Leroy D. Klas. "Comparing Personal, Social, and Institutional Variables for University Dropouts and Those Who Persist." College Student Journal, 23:16-22. Spring 1989.

Nettles, Michael T., A. Robert Thoeny, and Erica J. Gosman. "Comparative and Predictive Analysis of Black and White Students' College Achievement and Experiences." Journal of Higher Education, 57:289-318. May/June 1986.

Noel, Lee. "Increasing Student Learning and Retention: The Best Case for Academic Advising." In Beyond Change: Managing the Multifaceted Role of the Academic Advisor. Edited by Carl M. Chando. Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference on Academic Advising. ERIC ED 249 878, 1983.

Noel, Lee, Randi Levitz, Diana Saluri, and Associates. Increasing Student Retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.

"Notebook: For More and More Students, Going Back to College Also Means Going Back to Work." Chronicle of Higher Education, 36:A37. September 20, 1989.

Onofrio, Angelo, Patricia Snider, Patricia Valente, and Robert Witzke. A Student Development Model for Academic Advising. ERIC ED 300 095, 1988.

Ott, Mary Diederich. "An Analysis of Predictors of Early Academic Dismissal." Research in Higher Education, 28:34-48. Number 1, 1988.

Parris, Ralph L. Academic Advisement for Rural and Urban Freshmen. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.

Pascarella, Ernest T., Paul B. Duby, Vernon A. Miller, and Sue P. Rasher. "Preenrollment Variables and Academic Performance as Predictors of Freshman Year Persistence, Early Withdrawal, and Stopout Behavior in an Urban, Nonresidential University." Research in Higher Education, 15:329-49. Number 4, 1981.

Phifer, Paul. College Majors and Careers: How to Select a College Major. ERIC ED 292 021, 1987.

Polson, Cheryl J., ed. Academic Advising as a Form of Teaching: Proceedings of the Eignth National

Conference on Academic Advising. ERIC ED 263 817, 1985.

Pounds, Augustine W. "Black Students' Needs on Predominantly White Campuses." In Responding to the Needs of Today's Minority Students. Edited by Doris J. Wright. New Directions for Student Services Series, No. 38. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Purdy, Jeanette J. A Comparative Study of the Quality of Academic Advisement as Perceived by Day and Evening Students. ERIC ED 303 197, 1985.

Purnell, Silas. "Quality and Quanity Issues in Academic Advising of Minority Students." In Beyond Change: Managing the Multifaceted Role of the Academic Advisor. Edited by Carl M. Chando. Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference on Academic Advising. ERIC ED 249 878, 1983.

Quezada, Rosa, and Kathrine Jones-Loheyde. "Hispanic Women: Academic Advisees of High Potential." Improving College and University Teaching, 32:95-98. Spring 1984.

Ramist, Leonard, and Solomon Arbeiter. Profiles, College-Bound Seniors, 1985. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1986.

Richards, William. The Effectiveness of New Student Basic Skills Assessment in Colorado Community Colleges. ERIC ED 275 351, 1986.

Richardson, Bill K., Daniel Seim, John P. Eddy, and Marsha Brindley. "Delivery of Counseling and Psychological Services in Small Colleges: A National Survey." Journal of College Student Personnel, 26:508-12. November 1985.

Salamon, Linda B., Wayne T. Hanebrink, and George Commenator. "Faculty as Advisors." In Beyond Change: Managing the Multifaceted Role of the Academic Advisor. Edited by Carl M. Chando. Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference on Academic Advising. ERIC ED 249 878, 1983.

Sandusky, Sam T. Identification of High Risk Students from Matriculation Information. ERIC ED 283 585, 1987.

Schubert, George W., and Douglas C. Munski. "An Academic Advising Handbook as a Tool to Help Faculty Advisers." Journal of College Student Personnel, 26:360-61. July 1985.

Sharkey, Stuart J., Pamela M. Bischoff, Dorothy Echols, Carol Morrison, Esther A. Northman, Allison Liebman, and Brent Steele. "Pioneer Programs for Retaining 'At-Risk' Students." In Increasing Retention. New Directions for Higher Education Series, no. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Solmon, Lewis C., and Midge A. LaPorte. "The Crisis of Student Quality in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education, 57:370-92. July/August 1986.

Stodt, Martha McGinty. "Intentional Student Development and Retention." In Increasing Retention. New Directions for Higher Education Series, no. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

Syarif, Aljufri Boctoom, and Robert C. Harris. Holistic Model for Predicting Academic Success. ERIC ED 287 343, 1987.

Tacha, Deanell R. "Advising and Interacting Outside the Classroom." In Fostering Academic Excellence Through Honors Programs. Edited by Paul G. Friedman and Reva C. Jenkins-Friedman. New Directions for Teaching and Learning Series, No. 25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986.

The Task Force on Student Flow Model, Mount Royal College. The Student Flow Model: Issues and Recommendations. ERIC ED 286 426, 1987.

Tracey, Terence J., and William E. Sedlacek. "A Comparison of White and Black Student Academic Success Using Noncognitive Variables: A LISREL Analysis." Research in Higher Education, 27:333-48. Number 4, 1987.

Thornell, John, and Reid Jones. The College Admissions Equasion: ACT Scores Versus Secondary School Grade Performance. ERIC ED 278 687, 1986.

Tinto, Vincent. Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Tinto, Vincent. "Stages of Student Departure." Journal of Higher Education, 59:438-55. July/August 1988.

Trombley, Toni B. "An Analysis of the Complexity of Academic Advising Tasks." Journal of College Student Personnel, 25:234-39. May 1984.

Walsh, Richard W. "Changes in College Freshmen after Participation in a Student Development Program."

Journal of College Student Personnel, 26:310-14. July 1985.

Warchal, Peter, and Stephen Southern. "Perceived Importance of Counseling Needs Among Adult Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 27:43-48. January 1986.

Winston, Roger B., Jr., Theodore K. Miller, Steven C. Ender, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates. Developmental Academic Advising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

APPENDIX A

ADVISING SUPPORT MATERIALS

Weekly Schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
7:15 - 8:05 a.m.	7:45 - 9:00 a.m.	7:15 - 8:05 a.m.	7:45 - 9:00 a.m.	7:15 - 8:05 a.m.
8:10 - 9:00 a.m.		8:10 - 9:00 a.m.		8:10 - 9:00 a.m.
9:10 - 10:30 a.m. Chapel & Break	9:10 - 10:20 a.m. Chapel & Break	9:10 - 10:30 a.m. Chapel & Break	9:10 - 10:20 a.m. Chapel & Break	9:10 - 10:30 a.m. Chapel & Break
10:30 - 11:20 a.m.	10:20 - 11:35 a.m.	10:30 - 11:20 a.m.	10:20 - 11:35 a.m.	10:30 - 11:20 a.m.
11:25 - 12:15 p.m.	11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	11:25 - 12:15 p.m.	11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	11:25 - 12:15 p.m.
12:20 - 1:10 p.m.		12:20 - 1:10 p.m.		12:20 - 1:10 p.m.

PROGRAM PLANNING WORKSHEET

Name______________________________ Adviser_______________________

Fall 19___	Spring 19___	Summer 19___
Courses	Courses	Courses
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	
____________________	____________________	Other
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
Total Hours: ____	Total Hours: ____	Total Hours: ____

Major____________________ Student Ministry____________________

Fall 19___	Spring 19___	Summer 19___
Courses	Courses	Courses
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	
____________________	____________________	Other
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
____________________	____________________	____________________
Total Hours: ____	Total Hours: ____	Total Hours: ____

Major____________________ Student Ministry____________________

(Continued)

Program Planning Worksheet (Cont.)

Fall 19___	Spring 19___	Summer 19___
Courses	Courses	Courses
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	
___	___	Other
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	___
Total Hours: ___	Total Hours: ___	Total Hours: ___

Major___________________ Student Ministry___________________

Fall 19___	Spring 19___	Summer 19___
Courses	Courses	Courses
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	
___	___	Other
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	___
___	___	___
Total Hours: ___	Total Hours: ___	Total Hours: ___

Major___________________ Student Ministry___________________

GRADE ESTIMATE SHEET

Name____________________________ Date_______________ Adviser______________________

Course Name	Current Estimated Grade*	Percentage of Final Grade to Date	Total Absences to Date	Is Student Currently Behind on Assignments?	Instructor's Initials

*Letter and/or percentage grade

COURSE REQUIREMENT SUMMARY

Course Number/Name ____

Instructor ________________________________

Estimated cost of required books and materials ___________

Estimated number of pages of required reading ___________

Estimated number of hours per week of out-of-class study required for the average Practical student to receive a "C" grade in this class ___________

Number of major examinations ___________

Estimated number of quizzes ___________

Number of required library research papers ___________

Number of pages of research writing ___________

Prerequisites for the course:

Other major projects and requirements:

What is the major reason(s) some students perform poorly in this course?

ADVISING CONTRACT

Student______________________________ Adviser_____________________

I (student) agree to abide by the items checked for the remainder of this semester:

___ I will limit my course load to ______ hours this semester.

___ I will limit my employment to _____ hours per week.

____ I will meet with my advisor _____ times this semester beginning with ____
(time, date, location)

____ At each meeting I will bring a current grade estimate sheet initialled by each of my course instructors.

_____ I will also bring all exams, quizzes, homework assignments, projects and any other graded work from classes in which I have an estimated grade of "D" or "F."

____ I will set aside ______ hours per week for study and keep these hours exclusively for study throughout the semester.

____ I will see my advisor before taking action to drop a course, changing my major, or withdrawing from school.

_____ I will limit my participation in extracurricular activities to:

____ Other Agreements:

____ ________________________
Student's Signature Date

ACADEMIC RECORD PROFILE

Name______________________________ Application date ________

Year when last in high school or college: ________

High School Academic Record

GPA: ________ on a ________ scale GPA on 4.0 scale: ________

Rank: ________ out of ________ Percentile rank: ________

High school graduated: ____ public ____ Christian/private

High schools attended: ____ public ____ Christian/private

New York Regents diploma? ___ yes ___ no

H.S. Subject	Years in H.S.	Grade Ave.	GPA on 4.0 scale
English			
Mathematics			
Social Studies			
Natural Science			
Foreign Language			

Previous College Credit

College Name	Degree Completed	Credit Hours	GPA

Entrance and Placement Examination Scores

ACT/SAT Scores	ACT Score	National Percentile	SAT Score	National Percentile
Composite/Combined				
English/Verbal				
Mathematics				
Social Studies				
Natural Science				

Placement tests	Score	National Percentile
Bible		
Reading Comprehen.		
Reading Speed		

Academic Probation? ____ yes ____ no

Remedial English? ____ yes ____ no

NEW STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name________________________ Age____ Sex____ Home zip code__________

☐ single ☐ married If parent, number of children: under 6 yrs. ____
6 to 18 yrs. ____

Where do you plan to live during the school year?

☐ dormitory ☐ parent's home
☐ on-campus apartment ☐ off-campus apartment/home

What is your academic classification?

☐ 1-year Bible program ☐ special student
☐ freshman (3-yr. program) ☐ junior (3-yr.) ☐ senior (3-yr.)

If in the 3 year program, what is your major concentration?

☐ pastoral ☐ missions ☐ church ministries
☐ youth ☐ women's ministries ☐ music
☐ undecided

Have you attended college before? ☐ yes ☐ no
If yes, how far did you complete?

☐ less than 1 year ☐ 1 to 2 years ☐ 3 to 4 years
☐ bachelor's degree ☐ some graduate study ☐ master's/doctorate

What is the size of your home community?

☐ rural (pop. under 2,500) ☐ small town (2,500-25,000)
☐ urban (over 25,000)

How many people were in your high school graduating class?

☐ under 10 ☐ 10 to 50 ☐ 51 to 100 ☐ 101 to 300 ☐ over 300

What type of high school(s) did you attend in grades 9 through 12? (check all that apply)

☐ public school
☐ Christian academy--traditional classroom
☐ Christian academy--programmed/independent study
(e.g., Accelerated Christian Education)
☐ Home schooling
☐ Graduation Equivalency Diploma (GED)

What type of high school program did you take?

☐ college preparation ☐ business ☐ vocational/skilled trades
☐ general program ☐ not sure

(Continued)

New Student Questionnaire (Cont.)

What activities did you participate in during high school? (check all that apply)

☐ athletic teams ☐ debate/drama
☐ music groups ☐ student government

What is the highest level of education attained by your parents?

☐ some grade school/high school ☐ high school graduate
☐ some college ☐ associate's degree
☐ bachelor's degree ☐ master's degree
☐ doctorate

Did one of your parents attend PBTS?_____ Did both?_____

Do your parents (spouse if married) support your decision to attend PBTS?

☐ yes ☐ no ☐ maybe ☐ I don't know ☐ one does, one doesn't

What financial resources will you require to pay for this school year? (check all that apply)

☐ sufficient funds in savings for entire year
☐ financial aid required for attendance
☐ in-school employment up to 15 hours per week
☐ in-school employment of 16 to 25 hours per week
☐ in-school employment over 25 hours per week
☐ other resources
☐ I don't know how I will pay for this year

What college activities do you plan to participate in this year? (check all that apply)

☐ athletic teams ☐ drama team
☐ musical teams ☐ student government

What do you predict your overall grade point average to be for the semester?

☐ 3.5 to 4.0 (A or A-) ☐ 3.0 to 3.4 (B or B+) ☐ 2.5 to 2.9 (B-)
☐ 2.0 to 2.4 (C or C+) ☐ 1.5 to 1.9 (D+ or C-) ☐ 1.0 to 1.4 (D)
☐ below 1.0 (D- or F)

What is the likelihood of your grade point average for this semester falling below 2.0 (C average)?

☐ very unlikely ☐ possible, but unlikely ☐ probable ☐ expected

What is the likelihood of your dropping out of school either temporarily or permanently before completing your program?

☐ very unlikely ☐ possible, but unlikely ☐ probable ☐ expected

APPENDIX B

ADVISER TRAINING HANDOUTS

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD ADVISORS

Interested in academic advising

Available

Patient

Honest, sincere

Friendly

Caring listener

Concern for student's welfare over own or institution's welfare

Drive and desire to help others

Conviction that students can grow, learn and develop

Individualized perception and cultural adaptation

Competent in institutional policies and procedures

Information source

Objective--fact or data oriented

Willing to clarify

Willing to refer

Accountable, responsible, dependable

Collected from:

Lumpkins and Hurst (1987), Purnell and McKinley (1983), and Salamon, Hanebrink, and Commenator (1983).

INTRUSIVE ADVISING

Target Population

Any returning student with a college GPA below 2.0.

Any new student with a college or high school GPA below 2.0 or 80 percent.

Any new student with an ACT composite score below 15 or SAT combined score below 700.

Any student with significant problems that suggest that his semester GPA will fall below 2.0 (extensive family, work, or student ministry responsibilities, insufficient finances, questionable academic background, lack of moral support from family, etc.).

First Meeting (within first three weeks of the semester):

1. Initiate an advising contract
2. Set goals for the semester.
3. Begin time management and study strategies
4. Make assignments to be completed by the next session (referrals, materials to bring to the next meeting, estimated grades, etc.)
5. Answer questions.
6. Set an appointment for the next advising session.

Subsequent Meetings (at least once every month):

1. Review agreements in the advising contract.
2. Review assignments from the last session.
3. Monitor the student's academic progress.
4. Compliment and encourage any progress.
5. Make new assignments.

   *Begin long range program planning
   *Initiate career and life planning.
   *Initiate decision making strategies.
6. Answer questions.
7. Set an appointment for the next session.

*Begin only when the student is ready to move on to more challenging matters.

SUMMARY PROFILE OF NEW STUDENTS

ENTERING PBTS, FALL 1989

Sample: All new students (those never before enrolled at Practical) registering for more than six credit hours in the fall 1989 semester. Total new students: 63.

Demographics:
52% male (33), 48% female (30)
89% single (56), 11% married (7, all men)
10% of students have children under 18 years old (6)
57% of married students have children in the home (4)
3% of students are single parents (2, both women)

75% of students live in the dormitories (47)
8% live with parents (5)
8% live in on-campus apartments (5)
10% live in off-campus homes/apartments (6)

37% are one-year students (23)
6% are special students (4, but 2 claimed a major)
56% are freshmen (35)
1% are juniors (1)

16% are pastoral majors (10)
14% are missions majors (9)
13% are church ministires or youth majors (8)
10% are music majors (6)
6% are women's ministries majors (4)
1% are undecided (1)

Mean Age: 21.6   Median Age: 19
13% are under 18 years old (8)
52% are 18 or 19 years old (33)
13% are 20 to 22 years old (8)
22% are 23 to 42 years old (14)

37% are on academic probation (23)
16% are required to take ENGL 098 Reading & Study Skills (10)

ACT (SAT equivalent) Test Scores: n = 49
Mean: 16.4 (730s), Median: 16 (720-740)
Range: 5-27 (470-1100)

Placement Test Scores:
Mean Bible Percentile: 49.2, Median: 45, Range: 1-99
Mean Reading Comp. Percentile: 41.8, Range: 4-99
Mean Reading Speed Percentile: 38.8, Range: 1-96
Mean Speed: 208 wpm, Range: 75-392 wpm

(Continued)

Summary Profile of New Students (Cont.)

High School GPA or Percentile Rank: n = 55
Mean GPA: 2.6, Median: 2.4, Range: 1.2-4.0
Mean Rank: 43.8, Median: 40, Range: 2-97

Size of High School Graduating Class:
19% under 10 students (12)
21% 10-50 students (13)
27% 51-100 students (17)
19% 101-300 students (12)
11% over 300 students (7)

Type of High School Attended and Program Taken:
65% attended public high school (41)
19% attended Christian school--traditional (12)
19% attended ACE school or were home schooled (12)

32% took college preparation (20) --ACT mean 18.25
37% took general program (23) --ACT mean 16.15
27% took business/vocational (17) --ACT mean 12.6

Parent's Highest Educational Level:
48% some high school or h.s. graduate (30) --ACT mean 17.0
32% some college (20) --ACT mean 15.52
17% BA, MA, PhD (11) --ACT mean 17.57

Parental/Spouse Support of Decision to Attending PBTS:
87% yes (54) --ACT mean 17.04
10% no, maybe, I don't know, or one doesn't (6) --ACT mean 11.5

Financial Resources for this School Year:
30% had savings available (19) --ACT mean 17.4
37% require financial aid (23) --ACT mean 15.68
22% plan to work 15 hours/wk. (14) --ACT mean 16.75
33% plan to work 16-25 hours (21) --ACT mean 17.58
6% plan to work over 25 hours (4) --ACT mean 14.5
29% have other resources (18) --ACT mean 18.25
10% do not know how they will finance this year (6) --ACT mean 13.33

Semester GPA Prediction:
13% predict 3.5-4.0 (8) --includes 1 AP student
54% predict 3.0-3.4 (34) --includes 10 AP students
21% predict 2.5-2.9 (13)
10% predict 2.0-2.4 (6)

Possibility of Withdrawal or Stopout:
89% say unlikely (20) --including 20 AP students
8% say possible (5)

PRE-REGISTRATION INFORMATION

Chapel on Thursday (March 29) will be a required chapel.

All students and advisers should meet in Lowe-Wagner Hall. Everyone will meet together for the first half of the chapel to complete advising evaluations.

Students will meet with their advisers during the second half to complete registration forms. If you do not plan to take the "Regular Fulltime Course Load" (See the courses listed under your year and program below), please use the second half of the chapel to set up an individual appointment with your adviser to work out your schedule.

Graduating and non-returning students are required to attend the combined portion of chapel (first half), but are excused from the last half.

REGULAR FULLTIME COURSE LOAD FOR FALL 1990

All Juniors

HIST 201	History of Western Civ. I	3
THEO 201	Theology I	3
BIBL 201	Israel's Prophets I	3
BIBL 211	Christian Life & Witness	3
***plus concentration requirements below		3
		15

Pastoral and Missions-Translation:
GREK 221 Elements of Greek I

Missions-Cross Cultural:
MISS 221 Comparative Religions

Church Ministries-Youth and Church Ministries-Children:
CHMN 221 Ministering to Youth

Women's Ministries:
WOMN 221 Introduction to Women's Ministries

Church Music:
MUSC 221 Music Theory I

(Continued)

Pre-Registration Information (Cont.)

All Seniors

BIBL 412	General Epistles	3
THEO 202	Theology II	3
HIST 401	Church History I	3
***plus concentration requirements below		9
		18

Pastoral:

GREK 321 Greek Grammar
OR Ministry Elective
PSYC 321 Fund. of Counseling
_____ ___ Ministry Elective

Church Ministries:

CHMN 221 Min. to Youth
PSYC 321 Fund. of Counseling
_____ ___ Ministry Elective

Church Music:

MUSC 421 Hymnology
_____ ___ Music Elective
_____ ___ Ministry Elective

Missions:

MISS 301 Area Study
OR MISS 339 MAP
_____ ___ Ministry Elective
GREK 231 Greek Study Aids

Youth:

CHMN 350 Internship
CHMN 221 Min. to Youth
PSYC 321 Fund. of Counseling

Women's Ministries:

WOMN 221 Intro. to Women Min.
CHMN 221 Min. to Youth
PSYC 321 Fund. of Counseling

Second Sem. One-Year Students

DOCT 101	Doctrine Survey I	3
BIBL 101	Pentateuch	3
PSYC 101	General Psychology	3
BIBL 111	Life of Christ	3
SPCH 101	Fund. of Speech	3
PHED 101	Physical Educ. I	1
		16

COURSES THAT WILL NOT BE OFFERED IN 1991-92:

If you are required or wish to take one of these courses, you should do so this fall.

- Church History
- Comparative Religions
- Preparation and Use of Visual Aids (evening)
- Songleading/Children's Choirs/Choir Conducting (evening)
- Ministering to Youth

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

ADVISER EVALUATION OF ADVISING

DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate number for each statement to rate advising services based on your experience this year (1989-90).

Adviser's Name ______________________________

	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
1. I was well informed about who my advisees were.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
2. I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
3. I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
4. I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
5. I was well aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a courses, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
6. I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
7. I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
8. I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
9. I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
10. I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
11. I was well informed about academic programs and requirements in other departments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
12. I was well informed about course options for my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x

(Continued)

Adviser Evaluation of Advising (Cont.)

	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
13. I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
14. I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
15. Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
16. I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
17. I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
18. I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
19. I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
20. I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
21. My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
22. My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
23. My advisees grew personally, spiritually, and academically over the course of the year.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
24. The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
25. My overall experience with advising was positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x

STUDENT EVALUATION OF ADVISING

DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate number for each statement to rate advising services based on your experience this year (1989-90).

Adviser's Name ______________________________

	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
1. My adviser helped me understand college policies and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
2. My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
3. My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
4. My adviser helped me understand the requirements of my program.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
5. My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
6. My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
7. My adviser kept track of my academic progress throughout the semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
8. My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
9. My adviser helped me find answers to my questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
10. My adviser helped me clarify my educational goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
11. My adviser helped me improve my decision-making skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
12. My adviser helped me choose an appropriate student ministry or internship.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
13. My adviser made me aware of academic and career options available to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
14. My adviser helped me deal with academic problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x

(Continued)

Student Evaluation of Advising (Cont.)

	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Not Applicable
15. My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
16. My adviser referred me to the right people and programs to get additional help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
17. My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
18. My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
19. My adviser extended friendship to me in addition to academic advice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
20. My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
21. My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
22. My adviser helped me build self-confidence and independence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
23. My adviser tried to make our advising meetings pleasant.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
24. My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x
25. My overall experience with advising was positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	x

Please check your current academic year classification:

☐ One-Year ☐ Freshman ☐ Junior ☐ Senior ☐ Special Student

Please check your current academic concentration (3-year):

☐ Pastoral ☐ Missions ☐ Church Ministries/Youth
☐ Women's Ministries ☐ Music

ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate number for each item to indicate your preference for advising in the future.

	A	B	Strongly prefer A	Mildly prefer A	No preference	Mildly prefer B	Strongly prefer B
1.	No adviser training, but registration procedures are reviewed.	Advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	None.	Advisers receive an individual profile of academic, personal, and demographic data on each of their new advisees.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	None.	Advisers receive a summary profile of new students.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Students are assigned to advisers two weeks after fall registration. New students meet with the first available adviser at registration.	Students are assigned to advisers at fall registration. Students meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Advisers are incorporated directly into the registration line.	Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices set off with wall dividers.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	None.	Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester (first meeting in the first three weeks of the semester).	1	2	3	4	5
7.	None.	Advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for study time, tutorial assistance, meetings with the adviser, and review of tests, quizzes, etc., at the beginning of the semester.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Students are responsible for securing a student ministry on their own.	Advisers discuss student ministry selection with advisees and make recommendations to the director of student ministries.	1	2	3	4	5

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey (Cont.)

	A	B	Strongly prefer A	Mildly prefer A	No preference	Mildly prefer B	Strongly prefer B
9.	None.	Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career or ministry problems.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Advisers receive final grades for their high-risk advisees.	Advisers receive mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request more frequent estimated grade reports.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	None.	Advising materials are placed in the library for student use (list of available student ministries, course requirements, weekly schedule planners, program planning sheets, estimated grade report sheets, list of advisers' office hours).	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Pre-registration is done only by individual appointment with the adviser.	Pre-registration begins with a group registration/advising assembly, followed by individual appointments for those needing additional help.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to advisers at pre-registration time.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	At the adviser's option, office hours are posted on the adviser's office door.	Office hours for all advisers are posted in the academic affairs office, faculty offices area, student center, and library.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	None.	Advisers meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester.	1	2	3	4	5

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey (Cont.)

	A	B	Strongly prefer A	Mildly prefer A	No preference	Mildly prefer B	Strongly prefer B
16.	Adviser's meet with all advisees at least once each semester.	Adviser's meet with all advisees at least twice each semester.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The vice-president for academic affairs notifies students of changes in their academic probation status.	Advisers notify advisees of changes in academic probation status and meet with those in need of academic improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from the academic office. Adviser's approval is not required.	Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from their academic adviser, and must discuss course changes with their adviser.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Students get academic petition forms from the academic office.	Students get academic petition forms from their adviser.	1	2	3	4	5
		NEW ADVISING MATERIALS					
20.	None.	Weekly schedule planners.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	None.	Course requirement sheets outlining each course.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	None.	Long-range program planning worksheets.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	None.	Estimated grade and attendance report sheets.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	None.	Advising contract forms.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Adviser self-evaluation checklist.	Adviser evaluation of advising forms.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	None.	Student evaluation of advising forms.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR RETURNING STUDENTS

PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR RETURNING STUDENTS

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
My adviser helped me understand college policies and procedures. (Q-1)	4	3.94	1.17	4	4.32	1.15	0	+.38	-.02
My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand. (Q-2)	4	3.98	1.02	5	4.39	1.05	+1	+.41	+.03
My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take. (Q-3)	4	4.18	1.28	5	4.62	1.21	+1	+.44	-.07
My adviser helped me understand the requirements of my program. (Q-4)	4	4.00	1.19	4	4.31	1.09	0	+.31	-.01
My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program. (Q-5)	4	4.27	1.02	5	4.58	1.25	+1	+.31	+.23
My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals. (Q-6)	4	4.30	1.00	5	4.39	1.14	+1	+.09	+.14
My adviser kept track of my academic progress throughout the semester. (Q-7)	4	3.79	1.03	4	4.16	1.27	0	+.37	+.24

(Continued)

Median, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Returning Students (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns. (Q-8)	4	3.77	1.19	4	4.27	1.23	0	+.50	+.04
My adviser helped me find answers to my questions. (Q-9)	4	4.00	1.15	4	4.32	1.14	0	+.32	-.01
My adviser helped me clarify my educational goals. (Q-10)	4	3.88	1.11	4	4.17	1.05	0	+.29	-.06
My adviser helped me improve my decision-making skills. (Q-11)	4	3.85	1.02	4	4.07	.98	0	+.22	-.04
My adviser helped me choose an appropriate student ministry or internship. (Q-12)	4	3.84	1.13	4	4.19	1.11	0	+.35	-.02
My adviser made me aware of academic and career options available to me. (Q-13)	4	3.65	1.09	4	3.82	1.15	0	+.17	+.06
My adviser helped me deal with academic problems. (Q-14)	4	3.80	1.17	4.5	4.33	1.05	+.5	+.53	-.12
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	3	3.49	1.13	4	3.83	1.21	+1	+.34	+.08
My adviser referred me to the right people and programs to get additional help. (Q-16)	4	3.80	.95	4	3.88	1.14	0	+.08	+.19
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	4	4.00	1.33	5	4.62	1.35	+1	+.62	+.02

(Continued)

Median, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Returning Students (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits. (Q-18)	3	3.53	1.11	4	4.21	1.19	+1	+.68	+.08
My adviser extended friendship to me in addition to academic advice. (Q-19)	5	4.42	1.10	5	4.88	1.27	0	+.46	+.17
My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person. (Q-20)	4	4.25	1.10	5	4.96	1.16	+1	+.71	+.06
My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly. (Q-21)	4	4.17	1.18	5	4.77	1.21	+1	+.60	+.03
My adviser helped me build self-confidence and independence. (Q-22)	4	4.09	1.09	4.5	4.35	1.03	+.5	+.26	-.06
My adviser tried to make our advising meetings pleasant. (Q-23)	4	4.42	.94	5	4.88	1.00	+1	+.46	+.06
My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life. (Q-24)	4	4.18	1.00	5	4.62	1.04	+1	+.44	+.04
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	4	4.29	1.20	5	4.60	1.16	+1	+.31	-.04

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=52. Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

[2] Positive numbers for median and mean indicate an increase in satisfaction from pretest to posttest. Positive numbers for standard deviation (S.D.) indicate a decrease in the consistency of responses.

APPENDIX E

PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR ACADEMIC ADVISERS

PRETEST-POSTTEST DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR ACADEMIC ADVISERS

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
I was well informed about who my advisees were. (Q-1)	4	4.30	1.55	5.5	5.30	.80	+1.5	+1.00	-.75
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	4	3.90	1.51	5.5	5.30	.80	+1.5	+1.40	-.71
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	2	2.00	.77	5	4.30	1.20	+3	+2.30	+.43
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	2	2.00	.89	5	4.50	.90	+3	+2.50	+.01
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	3	2.90	1.30	4.5	4.20	1.50	+1.5	+1.30	+.20
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	2	2.10	.70	3.5	3.20	1.30	+1.5	+1.10	+.60
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	3	2.50	.81	4	4.60	1.00	+1	+2.10	+.19
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	3	2.70	1.10	3.5	3.50	1.30	+.5	+.80	+.20

(Continued)

Median, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Academic Advisers (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	2	2.00	.53	3.5	3.60	1.60	+1.5	+1.60	+1.07
I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements. (Q-10)	4	4.30	1.19	5	4.80	1.20	+1	+.50	+.01
I was well informed about academic programs and requirements in other departments. (Q-11)	4	3.67	1.25	4.5	4.30	1.30	+.5	+.63	+.05
I was well informed about course options for my advisees. (Q-12)	4	4.00	1.15	4.5	4.50	1.40	+.5	+.50	+.25
I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school. (Q-13)	4	4.00	1.10	5	4.60	1.20	+1	+.60	+.10
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	3	3.50	1.69	4	3.90	1.10	+1	+.40	-.59
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	3	2.60	1.02	4	4.00	1.20	+1	+1.40	+.18
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	3	3.30	.90	4	4.10	1.00	+1	+.80	+.10
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	3	2.70	.78	3	3.70	1.10	0	+1.00	+.32

(Continued)

Median, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Academic Advisers (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest[1]			Posttest[1]			Difference[2]		
	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.	Median	Mean	S.D.
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	3	2.90	.83	4.5	4.30	1.30	+1.5	+1.40	+.47
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	3	2.80	.87	5	4.50	.90	+2	+1.70	+.03
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	2.5	2.00	1.00	3	3.90	1.10	+.5	+1.90	+.10
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	2.5	2.40	.92	3	3.10	.90	+.5	+.70	-.02
My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made. (Q-22)	4	3.70	.64	3	3.30	.60	-1	-.40	-.04
My advisees grew personally, spiritually, and academically over the course of the year. (Q-23)	3.5	3.50	.50	4	3.70	.50	+.5	+.20	0
The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year. (Q-24)	3	3.33	.47	4	4.00	.70	+1	+.67	+.23
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	3	3.10	.70	4	3.70	.60	+1	+.60	-.10

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=10. Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

[2] Positive numbers for median and mean indicate an increase in satisfaction from pretest to posttest. Positive numbers for standard deviation (S.D.) indicate a decrease in the consistency of responses.

APPENDIX F

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF RETURNING STUDENTS

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF RETURNING STUDENTS

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
My adviser helped me understand college policies and procedures. (Q-1)	Pre	1	3	15	16	9	6	2
	Post	1	0	11	15	11	9	5
My adviser clarified any recommendations, policies, or procedures that I did not seem to understand. (Q-2)	Pre	0	3	13	16	12	3	5
	Post	1	1	6	14	19	5	6
My adviser knew my program requirements and kept careful track of what courses I needed to take. (Q-3)	Pre	2	3	9	15	14	8	1
	Post	2	0	6	12	17	13	2
My adviser helped me understand the requirements of my program. (Q-4)	Pre	1	4	12	19	9	7	0
	Post	1	1	9	17	16	7	1
My adviser helped me select the correct courses to complete my program. (Q-5)	Pre	0	1	11	21	11	8	0
	Post	2	0	7	13	14	14	2
My adviser helped me tailor my course selection to my career and life goals. (Q-6)	Pre	0	0	11	22	8	9	2
	Post	1	2	7	13	19	7	3
My adviser kept track of my academic progress throughout the semester. (Q-7)	Pre	0	4	16	16	8	3	5
	Post	2	2	12	13	14	8	1
My adviser encouraged me to talk about my problems and concerns. (Q-8)	Pre	1	6	15	9	15	2	4
	Post	1	3	9	13	15	8	3

(Continued)

Frequency Distribution of Responses of Returning Students (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
My adviser helped me find answers to my questions. (Q-9)	Pre	0	5	14	13	14	5	1
	Post	0	3	10	13	16	8	2
My adviser helped me clarify my educational goals. (Q-10)	Pre	1	3	15	17	10	4	2
	Post	0	2	11	18	11	6	4
My adviser helped me improve my decision-making skills. (Q-11)	Pre	0	4	15	15	12	2	4
	Post	0	2	10	20	9	4	7
My adviser helped me choose an appropriate student ministry or internship. (Q-12)	Pre	1	3	14	15	8	4	7
	Post	0	2	9	11	10	5	15
My adviser made me aware of academic and career options available to me. (Q-13)	Pre	2	3	17	16	8	2	4
	Post	2	1	16	12	10	3	8
My adviser helped me deal with academic problems. (Q-14)	Pre	2	2	15	13	10	3	7
	Post	0	1	9	10	14	5	13
My adviser made me aware of relevant and helpful resources at the college (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-15)	Pre	1	8	18	12	8	2	3
	Post	1	4	12	12	8	4	11
My adviser referred me to the right people and programs to get additional help. (Q-16)	Pre	0	4	15	18	11	1	3
	Post	1	2	15	10	11	3	10
My adviser was available to meet with me as often as I desired. (Q-17)	Pre	3	5	7	15	16	5	1
	Post	2	0	11	8	13	18	0

(Continued)

Frequency Distribution of Responses of Returning Students (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
My adviser suggested ways to improve my academic skills and study habits. (Q-18)	Pre	2	3	19	14	4	3	7
	Post	1	3	6	13	14	5	10
My adviser extended friendship to me in addition to academic advice. (Q-19)	Pre	1	2	7	12	24	6	0
	Post	1	2	5	8	14	22	0
My adviser was genuinely concerned about my welfare and growth, both as a professional and as a person. (Q-20)	Pre	1	1	10	18	14	7	1
	Post	1	1	4	8	17	21	0
My adviser really listened to my problems and responded to them honestly. (Q-21)	Pre	1	2	11	15	12	7	4
	Post	1	1	5	11	13	17	4
My adviser helped me build self-confidence and independence. (Q-22)	Pre	0	4	10	15	14	4	5
	Post	0	2	8	13	18	5	6
My adviser tried to make our advising meetings pleasant. (Q-23)	Pre	0	1	7	18	18	6	2
	Post	0	0	6	11	17	17	1
My adviser encouraged me in my spiritual life. (Q-24)	Pre	0	2	10	19	13	5	3
	Post	0	2	4	16	17	11	2
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	Pre	1	3	9	14	17	8	0
	Post	1	1	7	13	17	13	0

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=52. N/A - not applicable or no response given.

APPENDIX G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF ACADEMIC ADVISERS

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESPONSES OF ACADEMIC ADVISERS

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
I was well informed about who my advisees were. (Q-1)	Pre	0	1	4	0	1	4	0
	Post	0	0	0	2	3	5	0
I received notice of who my advisees were in ample time to help them through the semester. (Q-2)	Pre	0	3	1	2	2	2	0
	Post	0	0	0	2	3	5	0
I was well informed about the prior abilities and interests of my advisees. (Q-3)	Pre	2	7	0	1	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	1	2	4	1	1
I was well informed about the academic progress of my advisees during the semester. (Q-4)	Pre	3	5	1	1	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	0	2	7	0	0
I was aware of any plans my advisees had to drop a course, change their program, or withdraw from school in sufficient time to offer counsel. (Q-5)	Pre	2	2	2	3	1	0	0
	Post	1	1	0	3	3	2	0
I was aware of any academic or personal problems that affected the performance of my advisees. (Q-6)	Pre	2	5	3	0	0	0	0
	Post	1	3	1	3	2	0	0
I kept close track of my high-risk and academic probation advisees. (Q-7)	Pre	2	1	7	0	0	0	0
	Post	0	0	1	4	2	2	1
I was well informed about institutional services and assistance available to help my advisees (e.g., financial aid, tutoring, counseling, transfer credit, etc.). (Q-8)	Pre	2	2	3	3	0	0	0
	Post	1	1	3	2	3	0	0

(Continued)

Frequency Distribution of Responses of Advisers (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
I was well informed about the results of referrals for my advisees. (Q-9)	Pre	1	5	1	0	0	0	3
	Post	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
I was well informed about my advisees' program requirements. (Q-10)	Pre	0	1	1	4	2	2	0
	Post	0	0	3	0	3	4	0
I was well informed about academic programs and requirements in other departments. (Q-11)	Pre	1	0	3	2	3	0	1
	Post	0	1	2	2	3	2	0
I was well informed about course options for my advisees. (Q-12)	Pre	0	1	2	3	2	1	0
	Post	0	1	2	2	3	2	0
I was well informed about the availability of courses for upcoming semesters and summer school. (Q-13)	Pre	0	1	2	4	2	1	0
	Post	0	0	3	1	3	3	0
I was able to chart out the programs of my advisees from entry to graduation. (Q-14)	Pre	2	0	4	1	1	2	0
	Post	0	1	3	1	4	0	1
Recommendations that I gave my advisees were well documented in my advising records. (Q-15)	Pre	2	2	4	2	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	3	2	3	1	0
I was well informed about institutional procedures and policies. (Q-16)	Pre	0	2	4	3	1	0	0
	Post	0	0	4	2	3	1	0
I had sufficient time, information, and resources to really help my advisees. (Q-17)	Pre	1	2	6	1	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	5	0	4	0	0

(Continued)

Frequency Distribution of Responses of Advisers (Cont.)

Evaluation Questionnaire Item	Pretest/ Posttest	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	N/A[1]
I was satisfied with the level of support and recognition given to advisers by the institution. (Q-18)	Pre	1	1	6	2	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	2	2	3	2	0
I was satisfied with advising aspects of registration and pre-registration. (Q-19)	Pre	1	2	5	2	0	0	0
	Post	0	1	0	2	7	0	0
I was instrumental in the selection of appropriate student ministries or internships for my advisees. (Q-20)	Pre	2	3	4	1	0	0	0
	Post	0	0	5	1	2	1	1
My advisees met with me for advising as much as I would have liked them to. (Q-21)	Pre	2	3	4	1	0	0	0
	Post	0	3	4	2	1	0	0
My advisees followed through with recommendations that I made. (Q-22)	Pre	0	0	4	5	1	0	0
	Post	0	0	8	1	1	0	0
My advisees grew personally, spiritually, and academically over the course of the year. (Q-23)	Pre	0	0	5	5	0	0	0
	Post	0	0	3	6	0	0	1
The academic skills of my high-risk and academic probation advisees grew over the course of the year. (Q-24)	Pre	0	0	6	3	0	0	0
	Post	0	0	2	4	2	0	2
My overall experience with advising was positive. (Q-25)	Pre	0	1	8	0	1	0	0
	Post	0	0	4	5	1	0	0

---

[1] Pretest-posttest sample: n=10. N/A - not applicable or no response given.

APPENDIX H

RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION

RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: MEDIAN, MEAN, AND STANDARD DEVIATION

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Median[2]	Mean[2]	S.D.
No adviser training, but registration procedures are reviewed.	Advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures. (Q-1)	Advisers	5	4.2	1.1
		All Students	4	3.9	1.0
		Returning	4	4.0	1.1
		New	4	3.9	.9
None.	Advisers receive an individual profile of academic, personal, and demographic data on each of their new advisees. (Q-2)	Advisers	5	4.6	.7
		All Students	4	4.2	.8
		Returning	4	4.3	.8
		New	4	4.1	.9
None.	Advisers receive a summary profile of new students. (Q-3)	Advisers	5	4.5	.7
		All Students	4	4.1	.9
		Returning	4	4.1	.8
		New	4	4.1	.9
Students are assigned to advisers two weeks after fall registration. New students meet with the first available adviser at registration.	Students are assigned to advisers at fall registration. Students meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year. (Q-4)	Advisers	5	4.1	1.4
		All Students	5	4.2	1.1
		Returning	5	4.2	1.1
		New	5	4.2	1.1
Advisers are incorporated directly into the registration line.	Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices set off with wall dividers. (Q-5)	Advisers	4	4.1	.7
		All Students	4	4.0	1.1
		Returning	4	3.9	1.2
		New	4	4.1	1.0

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Median, Mean, Standard Deviation (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Median[2]	Mean[2]	S.D.
None.	Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester (first meeting in the first three weeks of the semester). (Q-6)	Advisers	4	4.3	.6
		All Students	4	4.2	.8
		Returning	4	4.3	.7
		New	4	4.2	.9
None.	Advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for study time, tutorial assistance, meetings with the adviser, and review of tests, quizzes, etc., at the beginning of the semester. (Q-7)	Advisers	5	4.5	.7
		All Students	5	4.3	.9
		Returning	5	4.5	.9
		New	4	4.1	.9
Students are responsible for securing a student ministry on their own.	Advisers discuss student ministry selection with advisees and make recommendations to the director of student ministries. (Q-8)	Advisers	3.5	3.5	1.3
		All Students	4	3.7	1.2
		Returning	4	3.6	1.4
		New	4	3.6	1.1
None.	Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career or ministry problems. (Q-9)	Advisers	4	4.0	1.0
		All Students	4	4.2	.8
		Returning	4	4.3	.8
		New	4	4.2	.8
Advisers receive final grades for their high-risk advisees.	Advisers receive mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request more frequent estimated grade reports. (Q-10)	Advisers	5	4.6	.7
		All Students	4	4.0	.9
		Returning	4	4.0	1.0
		New	4	4.0	.8

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Median, Mean, Standard Deviation (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Median[2]	Mean[2]	S.D.
None.	Advising materials are placed in the library for student use (list of available student ministries, course requirements, weekly schedule planners, program planning sheets, estimated grade report sheets, list of advisers' office hours). (Q-11)	Advisers	5	4.4	.8
		All Students	5	4.4	.8
		Returning	5	4.3	.9
		New	5	4.4	.8
Pre-registration is done only by individual appointment with the adviser.	Pre-registration begins with a group registration/advising assembly, followed by individual appointments for those needing additional help. (Q-12)	Advisers	4.5	3.9	1.2
		All Students	4	3.5	1.4
		Returning	4	3.3	1.5
		New	4	3.6	1.2
The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to advisers at pre-registration time.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time. (Q-13)	Advisers	4.5	4.2	.9
		All Students	5	4.3	.9
		Returning	5	4.4	.9
		New	5	4.3	.8
At the adviser's option, office hours are posted on the adviser's office door.	Office hours for all advisers are posted in the academic affairs office, faculty offices area, student center, and library. (Q-14)	Advisers	3.5	3.6	1.2
		All Students	4	4.1	1.1
		Returning	4	3.9	1.1
		New	4	4.2	1.0
None.	Advisers meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester. (Q-15)	Advisers	3	2.9	1.2
		All Students	4	3.9	1.1
		Returning	4	3.9	1.1
		New	4	4.0	1.1

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Median, Mean, Standard Deviation (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item		Analysis Group^1	Median^2	Mean^2	S.D.
"A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)				
Adviser's meet with all advisees at least once each semester.	Adviser's meet with all advisees at least twice each semester. (Q-16)	Advisers	3.5	3.5	1.0
		All Students	4	3.7	1.2
		Returning	4	3.7	1.2
		New	4	3.7	1.1
The vice-president for academic affairs notifies students of changes in their academic probation status.	Advisers notify advisees of changes in academic probation status and meet with those in need of academic improvement. (Q-17)	Advisers	1.5	2.4	1.6
		All Students	4	4.1	1.0
		Returning	4	4.0	1.0
		New	4	4.1	1.0
Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from the academic office. Adviser's approval is not required.	Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from their academic adviser, and must discuss course changes with their adviser. (Q-18)	Advisers	4	3.8	1.3
		All Students	4	3.7	1.3
		Returning	4	3.7	1.3
		New	4	3.7	1.3
Students get academic petition forms from the academic office.	Students get academic petition forms from their adviser. (Q-19)	Advisers	1.5	2.0	1.3
		All Students	4	3.6	1.1
		Returning	4	3.6	1.1
		New	4	3.6	1.0
None.	Weekly schedule planners. (Q-20)	Advisers	3	3.7	.9
		All Students	4	4.0	.9
		Returning	4	4.0	1.0
		New	4	4.1	.9
None.	Course requirement sheets outlining each course. (Q-21)	Advisers	4.5	4.1	1.0
		All Students	5	4.4	.8
		Returning	5	4.4	.9
		New	5	4.4	.7

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Median, Mean, Standard Deviation (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Median[2]	Mean[2]	S.D.
None.	Long-range program planning worksheets. (Q-22)	Advisers	4	4.1	.8
		All Students	4	4.2	.8
		Returning	4	4.1	.8
		New	4	4.2	.9
None.	Estimated grade and attendance report sheets. (Q-23)	Advisers	4	3.8	.6
		All Students	4	4.1	1.0
		Returning	4	4.1	1.0
		New	4	4.1	1.0
None.	Advising contract forms. (Q-24)	Advisers	3.5	3.5	1.0
		All Students	4	3.6	.9
		Returning	4	3.7	1.0
		New	3	3.6	.9
Adviser self-evaluation checklist.	Adviser evaluation of advising forms. (Q-25)	Advisers	3.5	3.6	1.4
		All Students	3	3.4	.9
		Returning	3	3.4	.9
		New	3	3.4	.8
one.	Student evaluation of advising forms. (Q-26)	Advisers	4	4.0	.9
		All Students	4	4.0	.9
		Returning	4	4.1	.8
		New	4	3.8	.9

---

[1] Sample sizes: advisers n=10, all students n=112, returning students n=55, new students n=57.

[2] Evaluation scale: 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=very good, 6=excellent.

APPENDIX I

RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

RESULTS OF THE ADVISING PREFERENCES SURVEY: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Strongly Prefer A	Mildly Prefer A	No Pref.	Mildly Prefer B	Strongly Prefer B
No adviser training, but registration procedures are reviewed.	Advisers receive pre- and in-service training in advising techniques, materials, and registration procedures. (Q-1)	Advisers	0	1	2	1	6
		All Students	4	2	31	36	39
		Returning	3	1	11	18	22
		New	1	1	20	18	17
None.	Advisers receive an individual profile of academic, personal, and demographic data on each of their new advisees. (Q-2)	Advisers	0	0	1	2	7
		All Students	4	5	17	45	45
		Returning	3	2	6	22	25
		New	1	3	11	23	20
None.	Advisers receive a summary profile of new students. (Q-3)	Advisers	0	0	1	3	6
		All Students	0	3	26	38	45
		Returning	0	1	11	24	19
		New	0	2	15	14	26
Students are assigned to advisers two weeks after fall registration. New students meet with the first available adviser at registration.	Students are assigned to advisers at fall registration. Students meet with the same adviser for the rest of the year. (Q-4)	Advisers	1	1	1	0	7
		All Students	6	3	17	26	60
		Returning	3	0	11	12	29
		New	3	3	6	14	31
Advisers are incorporated directly into the registration line.	Advisers are placed adjacent to the registration line in temporary offices set off with wall dividers. (Q-5)	Advisers	0	0	2	5	3
		All Students	5	6	22	31	48
		Returning	4	3	12	13	23
		New	1	3	10	18	25

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Frequency Distribution (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Strongly Prefer A	Mildly Prefer A	No Pref.	Mildly Prefer B	Strongly Prefer B
None.	Advisers meet with high-risk students at least four times during the semester (first meeting in the first three weeks of the semester). (Q-6)	Advisers	0	0	1	5	4
		All Students	0	2	22	37	51
		Returning	0	0	9	22	24
		New	0	2	13	15	27
None.	Advisers and high-risk students work out a written strategy for study time, tutorial assistance, meetings with the adviser, and review of tests, quizzes, etc., at the beginning of the semester. (Q-7)	Advisers	0	0	1	3	6
		All Students	2	1	21	27	61
		Returning	1	0	7	10	37
		New	1	1	14	17	24
Students are responsible for securing a student ministry on their own.	Advisers discuss student ministry selection with advisees and make recommendations to the director of student ministries. (Q-8)	Advisers	1	1	3	2	3
		All Students	11	8	20	43	30
		Returning	7	5	9	16	18
		New	4	3	11	27	16
None.	Advisers receive copies of student ministry evaluations and counsel students with potential career or ministry problems. (Q-9)	Advisers	0	1	2	3	4
		All Students	0	2	20	43	47
		Returning	0	1	10	18	26
		New	0	1	10	25	21
Advisers receive final grades for their high-risk advisees.	Advisers receive mid-term and final grades for their high-risk advisees, and may request more frequent estimated grade reports. (Q-10)	Advisers	0	0	1	2	7
		All Students	1	5	26	42	38
		Returning	1	3	12	17	22
		New	0	2	14	25	16

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Frequency Distribution (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Strongly Prefer A	Mildly Prefer A	No Pref.	Mildly Prefer B	Strongly Prefer B
None.	Advising materials are placed in the library for student use (list of available student ministries, course requirements, weekly schedule planners, program planning sheets, estimated grade report sheets, list of advisers' office hours). (Q-11)	Advisers	0	0	2	2	6
		All Students	1	1	16	32	62
		Returning	1	0	9	14	31
		New	0	1	7	18	31
Pre-registration is done only by individual appointment with the adviser.	Pre-registration begins with a group registration/advising assembly, followed by individual appointments for those needing additional help. (Q-12)	Advisers	0	2	2	1	5
		All Students	16	13	14	41	28
		Returning	12	6	5	18	14
		New	4	7	9	23	14
The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to advisers at pre-registration time.	The regular fulltime course load for each program and a list of rotating courses are distributed to both advisers and students at pre-registration time. (Q-13)	Advisers	0	0	3	2	5
		All Students	2	1	14	34	61
		Returning	1	1	7	14	32
		New	1	0	7	20	29
At the adviser's option, office hours are posted on the adviser's office door.	Office hours for all advisers are posted in the academic affairs office, faculty offices area, student center, and library. (Q-14)	Advisers	1	0	4	2	3
		All Students	4	5	19	34	50
		Returning	1	5	12	15	22
		New	3	0	7	19	28
None.	Advisers meet with advisees as a group for coffee and donuts in the student center once each semester. (Q-15)	Advisers	2	1	4	2	1
		All Students	5	3	32	28	44
		Returning	3	1	16	15	20
		New	2	2	16	13	24

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Frequency Distribution (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Strongly Prefer A	Mildly Prefer A	No Pref.	Mildly Prefer B	Strongly Prefer B
Adviser's meet with all advisees at least once each semester.	Adviser's meet with all advisees at least twice each semester. (Q-16)	Advisers	0	2	3	3	2
		All Students	7	10	27	35	33
		Returning	3	7	13	15	17
		New	4	3	14	20	16
The vice-president for academic affairs notifies students of changes in their academic probation status.	Advisers notify advisees of changes in academic probation status and meet with those in need of academic improvement. (Q-17)	Advisers	5	1	0	3	1
		All Students	4	3	22	35	48
		Returning	2	2	10	20	21
		New	2	1	12	15	27
Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from the academic office. Adviser's approval is not required.	Students get drop/add and withdrawal forms from their academic adviser, and must discuss course changes with their adviser. (Q-18)	Advisers	1	1	1	3	4
		All Students	13	7	17	42	33
		Returning	6	5	8	19	17
		New	7	2	9	23	16
Students get academic petition forms from the academic office.	Students get academic petition forms from their adviser. (Q-19)	Advisers	5	3	0	1	1
		All Students	7	3	41	36	25
		Returning	4	1	21	17	12
		New	3	2	20	19	13
None.	Weekly schedule planners. (Q-20)	Advisers	0	0	6	1	3
		All Students	3	2	25	41	41
		Returning	2	1	13	18	21
		New	1	1	12	23	20

(Continued)

Advising Preferences Survey: Frequency Distribution (Cont.)

Advising Preferences Survey Item "A" (Old System)	"B" (New System)	Analysis Group[1]	Strongly Prefer A	Mildly Prefer A	No Pref.	Mildly Prefer B	Strongly Prefer B
None.	Course requirement sheets outlining each course. (Q-21)	Advisers	0	1	2	2	5
		All Students	1	2	13	33	63
		Returning	1	1	7	14	32
		New	0	1	6	19	31
None.	Long-range program planning worksheets. (Q-22)	Advisers	0	0	3	3	4
		All Students	1	1	23	40	47
		Returning	1	0	9	25	20
		New	0	1	14	15	27
None.	Estimated grade and attendance report sheets. (Q-23)	Advisers	0	0	3	6	1
		All Students	3	3	19	38	49
		Returning	2	1	7	23	22
		New	1	2	12	15	27
None.	Advising contract forms. (Q-24)	Advisers	0	1	4	4	1
		All Students	3	5	45	37	22
		Returning	2	2	18	22	11
		New	1	3	27	15	11
Adviser self-evaluation checklist.	Adviser evaluation of advising forms. (Q-25)	Advisers	1	1	3	4	1
		All Students	4	7	56	35	10
		Returning	2	4	28	14	7
		New	2	3	28	21	3
None.	Student evaluation of advising forms. (Q-26)	Advisers	0	0	4	2	4
		All Students	2	1	31	44	34
		Returning	1	0	11	23	20
		New	1	1	20	21	14

---

[1] Sample sizes: advisers n=10, all students n=112, returning students n=55, new students n=57.

SIGNATURE PAGE

I certify that I have read and am willing to sponsor this Major Applied Research Project submitted by Ronald C. Kroll. In my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards and is fully adequate in scope and quality as a Major Applied Research Project for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

(date)	John Losak, Ph.D. MARP Adviser

I certify that I have read this Major Applied Research Project and in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for a Major Applied Research Project for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

(date)	Louis F. Weislogel, Ed.D. Local Committee Member

This Major Applied Research Project was submitted to the Central Staff of the Programs for Higher Education of Nova University and is acceptable as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

(date)	David S. Flight, Ph.D. Central Staff Committee Member